

THE
Eclectic Review.

APRIL, 1854.

- ART. I.—*Report of Select Committee of the House of Commons on Criminal and Destitute Juveniles.* June 24, 1852.
2. *Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Criminal and Destitute Juveniles.* June 28, 1853.
 3. *Reformatory Schools.* By Mary Carpenter. London: Gilpin. 1851.
 4. *Juvenile Delinquents.* By Mary Carpenter. London: W. and F. G. Cash. 1853.
 5. *Social Evils: their Causes and Cure.* London: Nisbet and Co. 1852.
 6. *An Account of the Reformatory Institution for Juvenile Offenders at Mettray, in France.* From the French of M. Augustin Cochin, LL.D. By the Rev. George Hans Hamilton, M.A., Chaplain of the Durham County Gaol. London: Whittaker and Co. 1853.
 7. *Plint on Crime.* London: Charles Gilpin. 1851.
 8. *Report of the Proceedings of a Conference on the subject of Preventive and Reformatory Schools, held at Birmingham, the 9th and 10th Dec., 1851.* London: Longman and Co.
 9. *Report of the Proceedings of a Conference on the Subject of Preventive and Reformatory Schools, held at Birmingham, the 9th and 10th Dec., 1853.* London: Longman and Co.
 10. *Three Charges.* By the Recorder of Birmingham, Matthew Davenport Hill, Esq., delivered to the Grand Jury of that Borough at the Michaelmas Quarter Sessions for the years 1850, 1851, and 1853. London: Longman and Co.
 11. *Prize Essays on Juvenile Delinquency.* By Micaiah Hill, Esq., and C. F. Cornwallis, Esq.

It is said that the people of England never move in the way of the reform of an abuse, or the correction of an evil, until they are made so uneasy by either the one or the other, that

quiescence is no longer practicable. It may then be safely affirmed, if this theory of the national character be true, that the thinking and benevolent portion of the English public are unusually uncomfortable as respects the extent, character, and evils, direct and indirect, pecuniary and moral, social and political, of juvenile crime. Within the last seven or eight years the legislature has passed many enactments for the better administration of the law in respect of offences committed by juveniles, and the government has adopted various new methods of discipline, correction and punishment, in the gaols appropriated to juvenile offenders. The subject, too, has occupied both Houses in various ways, in discussing measures proposed but not adopted, and especially in hearing evidence on the whole question of juvenile crime, its sources, forms, and remedies. Out of doors, prize essays on the subject have been written and published. Recorders, magistrates, and barristers have communicated their views through the press. The benevolent Miss Carpenter has laid society under deep and lasting obligation to her by the publication of the two eloquent and powerful works quoted above; whilst an active, earnest, and influential association, comprising members of both Houses of Parliament, and of the bar, chaplains of gaols, and public men, of mark alike for talent and benevolence, has brought the whole question before the national view, at two great gatherings in the central town of Birmingham, and have thereby so strongly attracted the attention of reflecting and practical men to it, that it may now be regarded as one of those problems, on the solution of which society is bent with a fixedness of purpose, so strong, that the ANSWER is only one of time.

A few years ago the *cry* was loud that *all* crime was fearfully on the increase, and there wanted not statistical evidence, at least up to 1843, in the number of committals to the assizes and quarter sessions, and of summary convictions, that such was the *fact*. The large decrease, however, in these classes of judicial administration in the three following years, 1844, 5, and 6, and the actual diminution in the ratio of crime to population, comparing 1850, 1, and 2, with 1840, 1, and 2, has led to a more minute investigation of all the phenomena; the conclusions from which may be thus briefly stated:—that crime is narrowed in its area, though more intense within that area,—that its amount, in relation to the general population, is dependent on other causes than such as are specifically moral,—and that even when those causes are identical in force, the actually detected crime, or the recorded violations of public law, are not to be taken as the exact measure of the national morality, comparing the convictions of one year with another. Still the idea

is, as it were, stereotyped in the public mind, that *juvenile*, as distinct from *adult* crime, *has increased and is increasing*; and although several of the most careful observers are of a contrary opinion, it is nevertheless true that there is a growing, nay, a fixed conviction, that other than existing means are required to meet the evil. The *necessity* of such new appliances is not denied; but it may be well, on the very threshold of the subject, to give some reasons why the fact need not excite either so much surprise or so much alarm as it undoubtedly did a few years ago, and as it still does, in the minds of *many* of the ardent and energetic friends of juvenile reformatory schools and houses of refuge. There is no longer any dispute that the aggregation of the population in large towns and cities is accompanied by the development and rapid growth of certain forms of crime; nor is it less a question of dispute that a criminal class, *per se*, is one distinctive feature of all such populations. The activity and frequency of crime is proportioned to the almost absolute dependence of that class on violations of public law for its very existence and perpetuation. It is in very fact a recognised section, and a well-known section too, in all towns of great magnitude, and *once established*, it is a class more removed from all ameliorating influences, more invulnerable to moral suasion and social sympathies, than any other. It constitutes a new estate, in utter estrangement from all the rest, and in dangerous antagonism to their peace, happiness, and well-being. It would not be philosophical to say that large towns and cities *generate* the criminal class. *The cause why* the class exists at all lies far deeper than any incidence of mere density in the population, or even of the degree to which secular instruction and *moral training, even*, pervade the community, though its numbers and character will be affected more or less as these latter influences are more or less abundant, and are co-extensive or otherwise with the whole social area; still it is undoubted that its distinctive features, and especially its marked *isolation* in the midst of society, are consequent on the facilities which large cities present for concealment, and the innumerable temptations and opportunities which they afford for the practice of depredation and outrage of every kind on the property and rights of all the other classes. The terrible licentiousness, and almost bestial habits of the entire class, are the necessary consequence of its isolation, and its seclusion in holes and corners, out of the view of all that is orderly, and pure, and good, as if it hated the sight; and surrounded by all the incentives, physical and mental, to the most sensual indulgences. Large towns, in fact, are a kind of moral cesspool, into which whatever is morally foul and putrid seems to descend, and to engender, by proximity and contact, a fouler putridity still. From

the isolation of this class, so aptly designated 'CITY ARABS,' and the total absence of all humanizing and moral influence within it, whether in the *domestic* circle, *where such exists*, the common lodging-house, and the low neighbourhood where it lurks, arise those peculiar characteristics of juvenile delinquents which at a glance reveal to the experienced eye of the gaol authorities and the police, the parentage and tutelage of the young offender, wherever he is met with. It is scarcely possible to realize, with sufficient distinctness and vividness, the negative conditions under which the child of the adult criminal, in such places as London or Liverpool, is brought up. Parental love and tenderness he scarcely knows, or knows only as manifested in maudlin fondness in the moment of half-drunkenness, or of mad revel after some successful feat of pocket-picking or burglary. Example, alas! he knows only in its worst forms of obscenity, blasphemy, unbridled passion, dishonesty, and perhaps brutal violence and murderous savageness of temper. Around him is nothing with which he is in contact, or with which he can hold converse, better than himself; it is the contact of wretchedness, ignorance, and immorality, with its like or worse; it is converse that sweetens not, or cheers, or improves. Society at large he regards with interest only as it presents materials for plunder, and therefore for his subsistence. The gay dreams and bounding joys of childhood he knows not; nor as he grows up to the age and stature of the youth, does life open with bright promise, or his mind expand with earnest effort towards its realization. He is in antagonism to society, not simply as he lives by defying its laws and wasting its property, but far more, as with whatever is 'pure and lovely, and of good report,' he is at war. He gazes on the spectacle presented in the happier condition of industrious and moral life; its domestic tenderness, peace, and love; its energetic and honourable toil; its high efforts in the walks of benevolence, and public usefulness; its swelling peal of lofty joy and gratulation in some moment of national success or common rejoicing, only to envy what he cannot possess or participate in, or to hate all that tells him he is an outcast and an alien. Sad as is this picture, it is but too faithful a delineation of hundreds, nay, thousands, born and nurtured amidst the filth, and vice, and crime of all kinds, in the dark, damp, and dolorous by-lanes and nooks, the horrid dens and caves, unknown but to the police and to the devoted missionary of our great cities. He is not simply a rude and uncivilized being; he is a perverted and evil-taught one. He has no counterpart in savage life, for it has its strong affections, its healthful occupations, and some rude institutions to maintain independence, and safety, and order. It is a *mal*-condition, so to speak, in whatever relates to the body, the intellect, the

emotions, or the conscience ; all that should be vigorous and energetic, inert, benumbed, or dead ; all that should be held in with the strong rein of discretion, and prudence, and disciplined affection, and a quickened conscience, rampant, unbridled, and uncontrollable.

If any doubt whether this mournful delineation be true, let them take up the Reports of the Commons for 1852 and 1853, and turn to the Appendix. It is no 'short and simple Annals of the Poor' they will meet with, but a most painful and harrowing biography of infant and juvenile life ;—a tale of brutal parentage or outcast orphanage ; of tender childhood, familiar with the lowest debauchery, with obscene scenic representations, with the cold midnight air under the shelter of a cart-body, or the portico of some wealthy man's abode ; of precocious mental activity and proficiency in all the arts of deception, fraud, and thievery ; of callous indifference to pain or shame ; of young hearts, hard as the nether mill-stone, or burning with the intense hatred and malignity which, even in the old and scarred criminal, affect the mind with an emotion almost too painful to be borne, and which terrifies whilst it pains, as though we were in contact with a 'spirit of evil.' A sad record of sorrow, wretchedness, vice, and guilt it is, and no less true than sad.

It is not surprising that benevolent men at the bar and on the bench have been startled and horrified by the disclosures of juvenile crime made in our Courts of Session and Assize, and have supplicated society, in earnest and eloquent terms, to save them from the harrowing spectacle, by adopting some reclaiming and reformatory means. Well might the benevolent Recorder of Birmingham, Matthew Davenport Hill, Esq., in concluding his speech at the Birmingham Conference of 1851, exclaim, on behalf of the bench,

'We implore you, then, to aid us with all your might in the great work we have in hand. . . . We pray you, on behalf of the whole judicial establishment of England, although we sit on its lowest bench, to shield us from the reproach of being the agents of a cruelty at once so odious and useless ! Help us, we beseech you, to reach that moral elevation, compared with which all social distinctions are as nothing, which we shall have gained when we feel ourselves the ministers of enlightened justice,—justice guided by knowledge, and tempered with mercy.'

Society has been so horrified by the spectacle of juvenile crime in such forms of revolting depravity, that its fears have been unduly excited, and for a time the erroneous conclusion extensively prevailed, that our whole juvenile population was being corrupted and ruined. The evil, both in its extent and character, is now more accurately measured ; and although statements are yet

put forward, giving a most appalling idea of the vast extent of the class, *destitute and criminal children*, the leading men of the movement are arriving at more correct views. Lord Shaftesbury stated at the Birmingham Conference, that the whole number of children in the metropolis, in training for a life of crime, did not exceed 3000; a very different number to that so frequently quoted by writers and speakers on the subject,—namely, 30,000! It is not the less imperative on society to grapple with the evil, which, as the same noble lord said, 'was in our grasp,'—a definite quantity, which might be compassed about, and so beset with appliances, penal and reformatory, as to be reduced to a *minimum*. That it will ever, and in any possible or probable condition of the world, be rooted out, and extirpated, may be believed by Optimists and Latter-day Saints, but *ought not* to influence the conduct of the philanthropist and legislator. He must deal with it as with all forms of social evil, as one of the conditions incident to man's being and to social organization, to be obviated and prevented as far as possible on the one hand, or to be counteracted and kept down on the other. It is the latter process which the active and earnest men and women connected with the Birmingham Conference are now intent upon. Their motto is, Reformatory Discipline,—not deterrent; the melting and subduing power of kindness,—not the stern correction and punishment awarded by inflexible justice; the awakening of dormant sensibilities and latent powers of mind, and above all, of an all but dead conscience, as the basis on which a new life can be reared,—the starting place from which a new and happy and virtuous career may be run.

It is assumed by these persons, and their whole effort would be useless or impertinent without such assumption, that the existing appliances of our penal and corrective system are greatly defective, if not, as many affirm, altogether inapt or absolutely mischievous. This much is, at the least, absolutely certain,—that the police station, the gaol, the penal ward, and the separate cell, fail to prevent the repetition of crime in nearly all cases where the delinquent belongs to the dangerous and destitute classes, the criminal and *vagabond* class, as they would be termed in America; nay, worse, it is all but certain that the youth *once in prison* will be found there again and again, until the last sentence of transportation shuts him up for a long term of years in Millbank, or a ticket of leave transfers him to another hemisphere and another zone, to spend, perhaps, the whole remainder of his life. Two distinct returns will place this fact in a clear point of view. The Rev. G. B. De Renzi, Chaplain of the Leeds Borough Gaol, laid the following table before the committee of the Commons:—

Number of male offenders under 17 years of age committed to the Leeds Borough Gaol betwixt the 11th of October, 1847, and the 10th October, 1848; *also*, their subsequent re-committals during the following four years up to October, 1852:—

	Offenders.	Committals.
Committed once	35	35
„ twice	14	28
„ thrice	18	54
„ four times	19	76
„ five times	8	40
„ six times and upwards	21	153
	<hr/> 115	<hr/> 386

It appears from this table that out of 115 juveniles committed in 1847 and 1848, 80 were re-committed in the four following years, twice, thrice, and upwards, three and a-half times each, or in the aggregate, 270 times.

The Rev. W. C. Osborn, Chaplain of the Bath Gaol, delivered to the same committee the following table:—

	1847.	1848.	1849.
No. 1. Children committed to prison for the first time	7,345	7,992	7,316
2. Juvenile old offenders	3,850	3,764	4,314
3. Total number of Juveniles committed	<hr/> 11,195	<hr/> 11,756	<hr/> 11,630
4. Juvenile old offenders—number of their offences	7,815	8,048	8,509
5. Total number of committals and re-committals of the children in prison	<hr/> 19,010	<hr/> 19,804	<hr/> 20,139

On the average of the three years, there were 7,551 first committals, and 12,100 re-committals, being as 1 fresh committal to $1\frac{1}{2}$ re-committal. Or, the fact may be put in another form. The average number of juvenile old offenders, in the three years, was 3976, and of their offences 12,100, so that each of the old offenders committed three offences yearly and was three times committed to prison; and the proportion of the old offenders to those committed for the first time being as 4 to $7\frac{1}{2}$, whilst their offences were as 12 to $7\frac{1}{2}$, it follows by another proof that the old offenders were three times as criminal as the former class. Similar tables could be produced from the records of every gaol in the kingdom, and it is admitted, even by those who cling tenaciously to the existing system of penal discipline for juveniles, that a young child once admitted for a term of two or three weeks within the four walls of a prison, and accustomed to its rules and become but too familiar with its evils and influences,—almost inevitably comes back again, sooner or later, until stopped in more mature life, or just at adolescence, by transportation. The system is, in one word, utterly powerless as a means of reformation, nay, it hardens, corrupts, and destroys.

The unfitness of our past and existing means of penal discip-

line to effect the reformation of juvenile criminals has long and loudly been asserted by those who are now taking the lead in seeking the establishment of industrial and reformatory schools. The witnesses examined before the Commons' Committee, excepting such as are identified with the existing system, were unanimous in opinion on this vital point—vital because the whole effort now making to establish a different system is justifiable only as the present one is proved to be inefficient or mischievous. It would only weary to quote these recorded opinions in detail ; and it would be a work of supererogation, inasmuch as the Select Committee, after hearing both sides of the question, has solemnly put on record its deliberate judgment. The third, fourth, and fifth resolutions adopted by them run thus:—

3. 'That it appears to this committee to be established by the evidence that a large proportion of the present aggregate of crime might be prevented, and thousands of miserable human beings, who have before them, under our present system, nothing but a hopeless career of wickedness and vice, might be converted into honest, virtuous, and industrious citizens, if due care were taken to rescue destitute, neglected, and criminal children from the dangers and temptations incident to their position.

4. 'That a great proportion of the criminal children of this country, especially those convicted of first offences, appear to require systematic education, care, and industrial occupation, rather than mere punishment.

5. 'That the common gaols and houses of correction do not generally provide suitable means for the educational or corrective treatment of young children, who ought, when guilty of crime, to be treated in a manner different from the ordinary punishment of adult criminals.'

Looking to the composition of the Select Committee, it may now be safely affirmed that the Commons' House of Parliament, *at least*, and reflecting and benevolent men out of Parliament, are agreed on the fundamental basis of future action, namely, that existing legal and judicial appliances are inadequate or inefficient, one or both. The moot points now raised are two—first, the kinds of reformatory discipline to be adopted ; and, second, who shall conduct and superintend it. There the divergence of opinion commences. On the one hand are those who maintain that no government action will prove effectual if it extends further than to the supplying of the funds and a vigorous inspection. These persons maintain that the class of administrators and teachers required in order to the successful management of destitute and criminal children, cannot be provided by any government ; that the ordinary tests of fitness for the office of teacher will not avail to secure the proper class of men and women ; nay, more, that it is in the very nature of all

government action, having a moral end for its object, to be cold, official, and perfunctory, and, therefore, to be either useless or mischievous. At the Birmingham Conference, the Earl of Shaftesbury, whilst admitting that 'voluntary effort would be inadequate to so great an undertaking,' asserted 'that government aid, *if alone given*, would soon become cold, formal, and ineffective.' The whole evidence of the Recorder of Birmingham goes to show that no mere government action will suffice; that the work demands earnest, benevolent, and religious men to conduct it; that in any other hands its results will be disappointing; and he emphatically states 'that all existing establishments, at home and abroad, for the reformation of criminal children which have proved successful, have had a large infusion of the voluntary principle.' Miss Carpenter's evidence and her two admirable volumes are but an elaborate exposition of the same opinion. On the other hand, governors of prisons, prison inspectors, and gaol chaplains and schoolmasters cling to official action, and, despite the acknowledged failure of all it has done, advocate amendments and alterations which, as they think, will make it effective. Both parties have now put forward their plans—that of the advocates of government action, in the resolutions of the Commons' Committee. The plan of the advocates of the voluntary system, aided by government money or local rates, and under government inspection, is given in Miss Carpenter's work, 'Juvenile Delinquents,' page 331. It is the plan of the Birmingham Conference of 1851. It requires provision to be made for three classes of schools—

1. Free day-schools.
2. Industrial feeding schools, with compulsory attendance.
3. Penal reformatory schools.

These schools are projected to meet the conditions of three distinct classes of juveniles—

'First. Those who have not yet subjected themselves to the grasp of the law, but who by reason of the vice, neglect, or extreme poverty of their parents are inadmissible to the existing school establishments, and consequently must grow up without any education, almost inevitably forming part of the perishing and dangerous classes, and ultimately becoming criminal.

'Secondly. Those who are already subjecting themselves to police interference by vagrancy, mendicancy, or petty infringements of the law.

'Thirdly. Those who have been convicted of felony or such misdemeanour as involves dishonesty.'

THE LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS NEEDED TO BRING SUCH SCHOOLS INTO OPERATION ARE—

"For the Free Day Schools, *such extension of the present govern-*

ment grants, from the Committee of Council on Education, as may secure their maintenance in an effective condition.

'For the Industrial Feeding Schools, authority to magistrates to enforce attendance at such schools, on children of the second class, and to require payment to the supporters of the school for each child from the parish in which the child resides, with a power to the parish officer to obtain the outlay from the parish, except in cases of inability.

'For the Penal Reformatory Schools, authority to magistrates and judges to commit juvenile offenders to such schools, instead of to prison, with power of detention to the governor during the appointed period, the charge of maintenance being enforced as above.

*'All the three classes of schools, the conference declares, will be best conducted by individual bodies, with close and rigid inspection from the state.'**

Their views, however, have been somewhat modified. At the second Birmingham Conference, held in December last, the following resolutions were passed:—

'That before proceeding to the consideration of legislative amendments required in the treatment of morally destitute and criminal children, this Conference takes the opportunity to express its cordial adoption of the opinion of the select committee of the House of Commons, "That it appears to this committee to be established by the evidence, that a large proportion of the present aggregate of crime might be prevented, and thousands of miserable human beings, who have before them, under our present system, nothing but a hopeless career of wickedness and vice, might be converted into virtuous, honest, and industrious citizens, if due care were taken to rescue destitute, neglected, and criminal children from the dangers and temptations incident to their position."

'That, properly to effect the great object contemplated in the preceding resolution, this Conference is of opinion that the country requires legislation for the encouragement of reformatory schools for children convicted of crime or habitual vagrancy; and that such schools shall be founded and supported in the manner pointed out by the resolution of the committee of the House of Commons—viz., partially by local rates, partially by contributions from the state.'

'That in the opinion of this Conference, every encouragement should be given to reformatory schools, supported by voluntary contributions, for the benefit of destitute and criminal children, and that power should be given to government, and to counties and boroughs, to contract with the managers of such institutions for the education and maintenance of criminal children therein; such institutions to be under government inspection.'

'That power should be created for sending children, convicted of crime or habitual vagrancy, to reformatory establishments for sufficient time for their reformation or industrial training, or until satisfactory sureties be found for their future good conduct.'

* The *italics* are in the original.

‘That, as a check to any possible encouragement offered to parental negligence, a portion of every child’s cost of maintenance at a reformatory school should be recoverable from the parents.’

‘That powers should be conferred, in certain cases, to apprentice boys on their leaving reformatory schools, or to adopt other measures, at the public cost, of enabling them to commence a course of honest industry.’

The true scope of these resolutions will best be understood by coupling with them the ‘resolutions of the Commons’—6 to 11—which run as follows:—

6. ‘That various private reformatory establishments for young criminals have proved successful, but are not sure of permanent support; and are deficient in legal control over the inmates.’

7. ‘That penal reformatory establishments ought to be instituted for the detention and correction of criminal children convicted before magistrates or courts of justice of **SERIOUS OFFENCES**.’

8. ‘That such penal reformatory establishments ought to be *founded and supported entirely at the public cost, and to be under the care and inspection of the government*.’

9. ‘That reformatory schools should be established for the education and correction of children convicted of **MINOR OFFENCES**.’

10. ‘That such reformatory schools should be founded and supported partially by local rates, and partially by contributions from the state, and that power should be given for raising the necessary amount of local rates.’

11. ‘That power should be given to the government to contract with the managers of reformatory schools, founded and supported by voluntary contributions, for the care and maintenance of criminal children within such institutions.’

Comparing the two sets of resolutions together, it seems pretty clear that the Conference approves the recommendation of the Report in resolution 8, that **PENAL REFORMATORY SCHOOLS** should be entirely at the public cost, and under the care and inspection of government. In the management of such schools, *voluntary action* would have no place; that must be confined to reformatory schools for the correction and education of children *convicted of minor offences*.

That voluntary effort would have a wide field here, there is no question. What it will have to do, and how far it is competent to do that, will be seen—if first, the physical, mental, and moral condition of the children whose reformation is contemplated be considered; and, second—if the results of the experiments made both in England and other countries be developed.

The characteristics of the child of criminal parents, in other words, of the criminal child, *per se*, have already been noticed. But the children for whom reformatory schools are to be provided, are not all of that class, nor do they constitute even a majority

of it. They are those described in the *first* and *second* heads (page 393), and it will be useful, and is indeed indispensable to look at this class more minutely, and to inquire what it is, and whence derived. The suitableness of the reformatory means will be best tested when the conditions of mental and moral disease are accurately described and thoroughly comprehended.

If a map were constructed to show the proportions in which the several classes are located in London, Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, and Bristol, different colours being used to distinguish the localities inhabited by the respective classes, say, red for the upper or wealthy class, blue for the middle class, green for the operative class, and black for the criminal class, it would be found that the red would be principally dotted round the extreme circumference of such plan, or in adjoining suburban villages and hamlets; that the blue would mark the best-built, and most healthy portions of the city or town, properly so called, and run along the outer edge of the main streets devoted to business; that the green would fill up the courts and alleys betwixt the main streets, and even large spaces in those parts of each town or city, where manufactures or small trades were carried on, with an occasional dot here and there of red or blue, and more frequent patches of black. The several classes would be seen to be separate and distinct in their localization, save that the criminal class would be in close proximity to, and be in fact, dovetailed in with the operative class.

This allocation of the classes has its specific evils. Classes, like individuals, rise by contact with something higher and nobler than themselves, or by the gradual development of some inherent germ or principle of growth. But the position of the preponderating class in London, Manchester, &c., is that of *isolation* or *distinctness*, in respect to the more refined and educated classes, and of close *contact* with the very lowest—the criminal class. Nor is there any redeeming feature in the degree of direct intercourse which arises out of the relation of employer and employed. The operatives are employed in large masses, and there is little and infrequent interchange of kind greeting or good offices; the manifestation of personal kindness on the one side, and of personal respect and attachment on the other. Here and there some master in whom benevolence is largely developed, takes a deep interest in the mental and moral advancement of his work people; but, save this, the intercourse of the two classes is only maintained through the ministration of the Sabbath-school teacher, the town missionary, and the minister of religion. Although the class is, in the main, intelligent, honest, industrious, and well-ordered in all things, there will be, and are, not a few idle, dissipated, and disorderly, neglectful of their children, and

especially of their education, whether scholastic or otherwise; given to sensual or vicious gratification, and especially in periods of distress—coarse, quarrelsome, or worse—obscene and profane. The dregs of the class are continually settling down into the ranks of confirmed and habitual criminality, there preparing for themselves and their children a qualification for the police-station and the gaol. As death, by disease or accident, carries off either one or other, or both the parents, or some serious offence separates husband and father from wife and child, the exposure of the unhappy children to demoralizing influences becomes more serious and fatal. Need it excite surprise that the juveniles of this class supply our bridewells and houses of correction with their inmates? That such is the fact, there is only too abundant evidence to prove. Of 192 juvenile prisoners in Bath Gaol September 30, 1848, to September 30, 1849, 33 were orphans; 17 had a father *only* living; 43 a mother *only*; total, 93 of *fatherless* or *motherless* children, or orphans. In the Liverpool *Borough* Gaol, 1845, at one time there were 66 juveniles, 48 families were visited, and this was the result:—

3 No parental care.

7 Homes plentiful and sufficient, *but parents, one or both, given to drink.*

4 Fatherless: had decent but barely sufficient homes.

4 Homes barely sufficient, *owing to the drunkenness of parents.*

7 *Each parent of bad character.*

8 *Parents following occupations unfavourable to morality.*

15 Parents decent; homes comfortable.

5 Homes plentiful and sufficient.

Miss Carpenter sums up the whole case in the emphatic and comprehensive sentence (p.155)—‘That the great mass of juvenile delinquency is to be directly and mainly attributed to the low moral condition of the parents, and to their culpable neglect of the early training of their children, or their incapacity to direct it.’ If, as Miss Carpenter elsewhere says, ‘a well-conducted family is the *order of Providence*, and is more calculated to develop the human being than any school can do,’—that must be the *most unfavourable* condition of infant and juvenile life, in which the family is ill-conducted, and when, besides, a thousand influences of evil in the neighbourhood, and in the sphere of daily life, tempt the *ill-taught*, or the *evil-taught* and neglected child, to a life of vagabondism, licentiousness, and crime! That such influences do surround and beset children thus neglected is too true. The child who prefers the streets and such associates as he meets with there, to home, or the school, will encounter temptation at every turn, and the first compliance will inevitably entail a second and a third. He will meet there the young criminal,

who will allure him to petty thefts, for the sake of the gratifications of sense he may thereby procure. The next step will be the resort to the low theatre, with its deeply debasing and corrupting influence; and to escape punishment for stopping out late, the low lodging house will be resorted to, and ere long will be his home, when he is not in jail! These steps of downward progress have been realized in hundreds and thousands of instances, in the cases of *almost* infants and juveniles born and brought up in the lowest and densely crowded localities of all our large towns; and when to all the influences described there is added brutal and unfeeling conduct on the part of drunken and debauched parents, or *step*-parents, it will be a miracle almost if the child escapes utter and final degradation and ruin.

It is this class, daily exposed to crime, or just committed to it by minor offences, such as petty thefts, &c., which the reformatory schools, founded and conducted by voluntary effort, are intended to save from a life of confirmed criminality, and the final excision from society by confinement in the jail or transportation to the penal colony.

With regard to such children the whole work of a right education is to be begun. What of intellect is developed, is active only for evil purposes, and, indeed, such knowledge as exists is of beings, and habits, and practices, which are perverted and evil—perception of right principle, obedience to moral law, there is none. Desire, appetite, or passion, are the ruling impulses to action; an ungoverned, undisciplined self-will the only law of life. It is no mere secular education, no official routine of the pauper school, that will meet the case of such children. There is much, very much to undo, as well as much to do, and, as a preliminary, altogether indispensable to the effectuation of either, the confidence, if not the affection of the child has to be won.

None but teachers who enter upon the duty under the resistless impulse of Christian love, *can* succeed. The heart which has never been opened to kindly emotion, or has had its fresh emotions of tenderness and love, rudely checked, suppressed, or choked, is to be brought to look on the hand which guides whilst it restrains, and may be punished, as outstretched in pure benevolence to save. But who can or will struggle with the waywardness and obstinacy of the nascent criminal, or wait and watch for the first movement of awakened conscience, the first perhaps feeble and half-repressed response of affection, save such teachers? Well might Miss Carpenter exclaim, after eloquently sketching the *ideal* of the Reformatory Teacher, 'No government money can purchase, no government appliances and tests can make or find such. Such, however, have been found, or, to speak more correctly, such men, moved by the misery, and wretchedness, and deep

degradation of the class of juvenile criminals, have voluntarily undertaken the task of reclamation and restoration, repulsive as it is in so many of its features, and HAVE SUCCEEDED.' That juvenile criminals *can* be reclaimed has been proved by these devoted Christian men and women, when government failure was so complete that statesmen and judges, the senate and the bar, each and all confessed their impotence to deal with the evil.

It is impossible within the compass of a review to give even an outline of the *system* pursued in the voluntary Reformatory Institutions of France, Germany, Belgium, Hamburgh, the United States, and our own country. Those who desire a complete mastery of this part of the subject will find abundant information in the report of 1852; and chiefly in the evidence of David Power, Esq., the recorder of Ipswich; of George Bunsen, Esq., son of the Chevalier Bunsen; A. Thomson, Esq., the well-known patron of the Aberdeen schools for ragged and destitute and criminal children, and the coadjutor of Sheriff Watson, in that eminently successful attempt to suppress mendicancy, and cut off crime at its source; in the evidence of Mr. William Locke, the honorary secretary of the London Ragged School Union, and of the Rev. S. Turner, the enlightened chaplain of the Philanthropic Society's Farm School at Red Hill, near Reigate. There is also an elaborate paper on the farm-school system of the Continent in the appendix to the Commons Report of 1853, page 402, &c., by the late J. Fletcher, Esq. Those who desiderate a more popular account of these schools and their results, may consult with advantage Miss Carpenter's two volumes, and especially the sixth and seventh chapters of the one entitled 'Juvenile Delinquency;' and also the interesting little volume, by Mr. Thompson, 'Social Evils; their Causes, and Cure.' It must suffice here to say that it has been demonstrated, that from seventy to eighty per cent. of the perishing and neglected children of the vicious classes, the 'moral orphans' of society, as Mr. Hill terms them (a term too mournfully apposite), may be permanently restored to society as useful and virtuous, instead of destructive, dangerous, and vicious members. Attention has been so forcibly drawn to the subject of juvenile crime, its source, and remedies, that legislation, as well as voluntary action, will inevitably be strongly directed to abate, if not extinguish, juvenile crime; and it behoves all *public men*, at least, to be prepared to give a wise and well-considered verdict on the measures which may be proposed.

Those measures will be of two kinds:—*First*, the establishment of PENAL REFORMATORY SCHOOLS for juvenile criminals, solely under government management; and, *second*, REFORMATORY SCHOOLS for destitute, neglected children, either just on the borders of crime, or already guilty of petty offences,—these

schools being under the management of voluntary associations, but aided by grants out of the national Exchequer, or local rates, and under strict inspection by the government. The first class of schools being intended for such juveniles as have been convicted of *serious* offences, it may safely be concluded that the legislature will not allow of any admixture of voluntary agency. It will rely on gaol governors, chaplains, and schoolmasters, and the teachers of agricultural schools, on codes of prison discipline, and on prison inspectors, as heretofore; and whether successful, or otherwise, all who know how tenaciously the legislature clings to whatever device, administrative, fiscal, or judicial, it may have adopted, and how strong are the interests which oppose all change in established routine, will conclude that the system will have a protracted trial. It is, then, matter of deep moment to the final success of reformatory appliances for juvenile delinquency, that those who have worked out the experiment *so far*, should take most especial and jealous care that no element be allowed to enter into the instrumentality hitherto so successful, which shall dis-arrange, or weaken, or destroy its adaptation and right action to the end contemplated. Now, there are two distinct points, of vital consequence, on which government and voluntary action differ in reference to the question of juvenile reformation. First. The government is not likely to abandon the resort to punishment, as a means, *per se*, of effecting this great end. The questions put to the witnesses, and the evidence of these latter, go to show that an opinion extensively prevails amongst public men, that punishment is part and parcel of the moral order of judicial action,—the proper inevitable sequence of a violation of the law of the community; that it is a necessary assertion of the majesty and supremacy of law, and a vindication of its moral rectitude, *as well* as a means of moral discipline and reform. Without entering into the abstract question involved in this view, it may suffice for the present purpose in noticing it, that, *as respects juvenile offenders*, the opinion of those who have, for the first time, shown *how* these may be reclaimed, is totally adverse to the use of *direct* punishment, or to any punishments but such as are common in the discipline of a family; and that they repudiate, as means of reform, all appliances but such as act by the constraint of love, the melting of kindness, and the suasion of religious principles and sanctions. The second point of difference respects the instruments or agents of administration. Supposing the government to adopt, in its penal schools, the entire theory of reformatory action, as developed at Mettray, the Rauhe Haus, or at Redhill, it is maintained by high authorities that it would not secure the same class of administrators, and, therefore, that its action would either fail altogether, or fall very

far short in its results of the action of voluntary societies. The reason why government *does* not secure the same class of administrators is not an occult one. Government offices are matters of patronage, and are obtained, but too often, through influences not corrupt, but having rather reference to personal obligations and the desire to serve friends and partisans, than to the actual fitness of the applicant. But were it not so—were all appointments made with the strictest impartiality, and a single aim to the public interest and welfare, government has no tests which will reach further than to discriminate intellectual fitness and attainment, and certain conventional moral proprieties, in the candidates for office. It is, besides, an unavoidable circumstance, that such appointments are sought as a means of comfortable livelihood, and not always and absolutely because they open a wide field in which a warm benevolence and an ardent love for the souls of men can find room to expand. On the other hand, the voluntary labourer, in any walk of Christian effort, is so because love constrains him, and his conscience will not be satisfied unless the duty be discharged, and the call to usefulness be obeyed with all his might.

If these views are just, government action will fail as applied to juvenile reformation. It is therefore of infinite moment not to entrust *all* to the government in the management of reformatory schools until government has shown in the PENAL reformatory schools that it can realize the reformation of mind and conduct exhibited in the pupils of the VOLUNTARY REFORMATORY SCHOOLS of Continental Europe and England. Experience in a field of operation closely analogous—the pauper and industrial schools of the land—is unfavourable to the expectation of success. There was a marvellous unanimity of opinion amongst all the *non-official* witnesses that such schools are complete failures, and just for the reasons already named. It will be said that it is not intended to hand over all the schools to government care. Granted; but is it certain that government participation and inspection does not include, as an ultimate and inevitable sequence, government supremacy, nay, more, government absolutism? It will be well to take no leap in the dark, but to exhaust this question fully before committing the whole business of juvenile reform to the ‘cold, *official*, and *formal* action of government.’ The benevolent and earnest men who are now asking for public money that they may have ‘room and verge enough’ for the exercise of their zeal, and to submit to inspection as the price of aid, may live to realize the fable of the ‘Horse, the Man, and the Stag,’ in other words, to find they have got a master and not an auxiliary. Government inspectors are, as a

class, given to theories, and covetous of power; no men so confident that, if the world would move in their groove, all would work easy; and the woes and sorrows, and vices and crimes which make it so sad and doleful, would cease. They are also, to a man almost, animated by the *esprit de corps*. There is no help out of the pale of their ministrations. Will *they* rest satisfied with inspection? Let the zealous friends of the movement be quite sure they have good grounds for an affirmative answer before committing themselves.

This caution does not originate in any mere anxiety for the fate of a theory, or to protect a pet crotchet, but in order that contending theories may, for once, have a fair trial. Let the government establish its penal reformatory schools; it may do that without much additional cost, and in part, at least, with existing appliances. On the other hand, let voluntary associations establish reformatory schools for the SECOND CLASS of children before described, independent of government money and government inspection. The voluntary system of juvenile reformation has not yet had full trial in this country. Its supporters are only now beginning to make an impression on the public mind, and just when they have bespoken the public ear, and with perseverance may fairly calculate on a general response, they turn to the government, and ask its aid. The conclusion has been somewhat hastily arrived at, that voluntary liberality will not supply the needful funds; and as if to ensure that result, the government is resorted to ere the general mind has been awakened to the importance of the work to be done, and the exact adaptation of the means proposed to effect it. It is a fact that inquiry has extensively been awakened, and men are working out the problem in their minds; this once solved, action will as assuredly follow as it did the conviction that slavery was a heinous crime in the sight of God and a foul wrong upon man; or that free trade was at once just, wise, and beneficent. No device could be imagined better calculated to stop inquiry, and to damp the benevolent zeal of those classes from whom almost all ameliorating and humanizing influences have emanated, than, at the critical moment of a final decision, to take the work, in part or whole, out of the sphere of voluntary action. There surely could not be any difficulty in sustaining three or four model schools, by which the comparative merits of government and voluntary management could be fairly tested, and should the result be decisively in favour of the latter, we have faith in the life and vigour of the national benevolence to accomplish the whole work. If the government does the work better, it ought to do it; and will not only be permitted, but be urged and importuned to do it. By one or the other it must be done, for neither regard to the safety

of the other classes of society, nor the promptings of Christian charity and love, will permit the class of destitute and criminal children to lie weltering in their blood, whilst the remedy is sovereign in power and of world-wide notoriety.

ART. II.—*History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, &c.* By James Seaton Reid, D.D., M.R.I.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical and Civil History in the University of Glasgow. Continued to the present time by W. D. Killen, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology for the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Vol. III. London: Whittaker and Co. 1853.

DR. REID, the author of this history, was a native of Lurgan, in the county Armagh, being the twenty-first child of his parents. On the 20th of July, 1819, he was ordained minister of Donegore, from which he removed to Carrickfergus in 1823. In 1827 he was unanimously chosen Moderator of the Synod of Ulster, though then but a young man, and in 1830 he was elected its clerk. He resigned his charge in Carrickfergus on being appointed to the newly-erected chair of Ecclesiastical History in Belfast, in 1838. In April, 1841, he was nominated by the Crown, Professor of Ecclesiastical and Civil History in the University of Glasgow. He died at the seat of Lord Mackenzie, near Edinburgh, on the 26th of March, 1851, in the fifty-third year of his age. In consideration of his valuable contributions to historical literature, the Crown, since his death, granted a pension of £100 a-year to his family. While he remained in Ireland he enjoyed a large share of influence in the body to which he belonged, his character and talents being held in high esteem by all parties. He was better informed than any of his brethren in the history of the church and the forms of ecclesiastical procedure. He was well fitted, both by the cast of his mind and his official position, for historical investigations. Destitute of imagination and the graces of style, he was industrious, methodical, exact, sagacious, and conscientious. As a zealous Presbyterian, a cool-headed evangelical, and a moderate whig, he sometimes argues against facts, but he never suppresses them. He availed himself largely of MS. authorities and other original sources of information in the State Paper Office, London, in Trinity College Library, Dublin, and in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, &c. As a historian he is fairly entitled to the praise of diligent research, accurate knowledge, clear judgment, impar-

tiality, perspicuity in his narrative, and a judicious treatment of political affairs in their relation to the dissenters of Ireland. The history of that body had never before been fully written. This work, therefore, possesses great value at the present time. It throws much light on various questions now occupying the attention of the legislature.

This is the third and concluding portion of the work, the former volumes having been published many years ago. Of the present, not much more than half proceeds from the pen of Dr. Reid. The MS., which was scarcely sufficient to form a volume, ends very abruptly. Referring to the subject of education, he had written at the bottom of the page, part of the word ministerial, ('min—') which he was not permitted to finish, as death terminated his work on earth after a few weeks' illness. Under these circumstances his executors intrusted the materials which he had collected to Dr. Killen, his successor in the chair of Ecclesiastical History in Belfast. This gentleman was well-qualified for his task. It is seldom that historical continuations are successful; but this of Dr. Killen matches well with what went before. It is executed in a very satisfactory manner. While the style flows freely, there is no falling off in the more solid qualities which give value to the work of Dr. Reid. The interest of the history, too, becomes greater as it approaches our own times, and deals with the parties, movements, and controversies, whose effects are still visible in the social system. Indeed, those who read this volume will be surprised to find the history of Irish dissent since the Revolution of 1688 so interesting and instructive.

On Saturday, the 14th of June, 1690, King William landed at Carrickfergus. He immediately mounted on horseback and rode through the main streets, amidst an innumerable crowd of people, who received him with continual shouts and acclamations. He then proceeded to Belfast, where he attended divine service in the parish church. On Monday, the Rev. George Walker, Governor of Derry, accompanied by a number of Episcopal ministers, presented him with an address from 'the Clergy of the Church of Ireland now in Ulster.' The Presbyterian clergy were equally forward to testify their loyalty to the Protestant Deliverer, and three of them presented an address from 'the Presbyterian Ministers and those of their persuasion in the North of Ireland.' These addresses were very graciously received. On Thursday the King proceeded to Hillsborough, which was the head-quarters of the army, and there he issued the well-known order, addressed to Christopher Carleton, the Collector of the Customs of Belfast, authorizing the payment of £1200 yearly to the Presbyterian clergy of Ulster. This was the origin of *regium*

donum, or royal bounty. Having referred to the address which had been presented from the ministers, the king adds, 'And calling to mind how early they also were in their address unto us on our arrival in England, and the promise we then made them of a pension of £800 per annum for their subsistence, which by reason of several impediments hath not yet been made effectual unto them; And being assured of the peaceable and dutiful temper of our said subjects, and sensible of the losses they have sustained, and their constant labour to unite the hearts of others in zeal and loyalty towards us; we do hereby, of our Royal Bounty,' &c. It is curious that there is not the least allusion to religion or to protestantism in this grant. It was bestowed, not on the ground of protestantism, but of loyalty. However, as there were legal difficulties in the way of the payment by the Collector of Customs, in September of the following year, letters patent, in the names of William and Mary, placed the bounty on the Irish establishment, and made it payable out of the Exchequer.

The Presbyterian professions of loyalty to the House of Orange were certainly much more consistent and trustworthy than those of the Church of England. Her clergy had entered on their benefices by subscribing the declaration, 'that it is not lawful, upon any pretence whatsoever, to take up arms against the king.' While James's power was in the ascendant in Dublin, they prayed for King James, and for confusion to all his enemies, William included. But when the legitimate king had fled, they hastened to alter the collects, and substitute *William*, whom they had been devoutly reprobating as a usurper, and who had placed himself at the head of rebels. In fact, as one of themselves afterwards alleged, 'they had been four times in one year praying forward and backward, point blank contradictory to one another.' Nevertheless, the bishops assured William that during James's residence in Dublin they had been 'guilty of no compliances but such as were the effects of prudence and self-preservation.'

After a gloomy interval of thirty years, during which, though half the ministers had fled to Scotland, and a number of the meeting-houses had been levelled, the people held together, and multiplied, the Presbyterian cause began rapidly to revive. In 1692 the nonconformists of Ulster were much more numerous than the members of the established church. Leslie, a Protestant dignitary of the time, writes, 'Some parishes have not ten, some not six, that come to church, while the Presbyterian meetings are crowded with thousands, covering all the fields. This is ordinary, in the county of Antrim especially, &c. Upon the whole,' he adds, 'they are not one to fifty.' The number of Presbyterian congregations were now one hundred, with eighty

ministers. But the public worship of dissenters, though connived at, was not only unsanctioned, but legally prohibited under severe penalties.

'At this period,' says Dr. Reid, 'the respective legal positions of the English and Irish nonconformists were very singular and anomalous. In *England*, the worship of the dissenter was legalized, but he was personally incapable of holding any public office, however humble, unless he would qualify for it by taking the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in his parish church. In *Ireland*, on the other hand, the dissenter was eligible to all public offices, but his worship and discipline were absolutely prohibited by law, and were only connived at in deference to the known sentiments of King William.'—Vol. iii. p. 22. Note.

Notwithstanding an abortive attempt made by the Irish bishops to get the Sacramental Act extended to Ireland, the nonconformists lived for some time unmolested in the exercise of their religious rites, generally maintaining relations of amity with their Episcopalian neighbours, and rapidly rising in social influence. All the protestant ministers cordially co-operated in repairing the effects of the war on the religious habits of the people, avoiding polemics and invidious attempts at proselytism. There was one churchman, however, Dr. King, the new Bishop of Derry, who regarded this state of things with no friendly eye. Able, ambitious, zealous, and energetic, having abjured his non-resistance doctrine, and attached himself to the triumphant cause of William with ostentatious alacrity, he was rewarded with the see of Derry, in which he found the affairs of his church in a ruinous condition. He resolved to bring the Presbyterians into the empty fold, and immediately commenced a series of polemical attacks on dissent, in which he persevered, with increasing acrimony, for many years. At first, however, out of deference to the Court, he avoided the question of church government, because, as he owned to a brother prelate, 'the subject is new and ticklish, especially in respect of the foreign church, and must be handled with a wary hand.' He says that when he came to the diocese, he found the dissenters 'mighty insolent,' but he adds, 'since my book came out they are mute; no persuasions will avail with them to dispute or talk of religion, and the members of our church insult over them on this account.' One of his objections was the infrequency of Presbyterian communion, which the bishop alleged as a proof that the Presbyterian system was unscriptural. By way of excuse for this, Dr. Reid gives the items of expense attending the communion in Londonderry, which is instructive as showing the social state of Ulster a hundred and sixty years ago:—

'On the 25th of June, 1694, the minister and session resolved that

the Lord's Supper should be administered in that congregation. For this purpose it was necessary to send a person all the way to Belfast to purchase the wine, consisting of thirty-six bottles of claret; and two other persons were authorized to provide the wheat, and get it ground and baked. The expences of this communion amounted to above six guineas, a large sum in those days. The following are the items:—Wine, £4 17s. 6d.; carriage, 12s.; wheat, 8s.; grinding, 1s. 2d.; baking, 2s. 6d.; cask, 2s. 8d.; tickets, 3s. 6d.; nails, 6d. Total, £6 7s. 10d.'—*Ib.* p. 28.

The Presbyterian ministers were not silent under Dr. King's attacks, and a war of pamphlets was kept up by both sides for many years; the church party at length calling in the aid of the more carnal weapons of the civil magistrate to disable their adversaries.

At the close of the seventeenth century there were a number of French refugees in Ireland, who formed congregations in Dublin, Cork, Waterford, Carlow, Portarlington, Dundalk, and Castleblayney, their ministers being paid by the state. These congregations are now all extinct, the people having been gradually absorbed by the established church—some of whose ministers and gentry now bear the names of those French Protestants. Even they did not escape persecution in the reign of Anne.

While the political position of the Presbyterians remained unchanged, they advanced rapidly in numbers and social influence. In the principal towns of Ulster they had become members of the corporations, in which they occupied the highest offices. New congregations sprang up in various directions; houses of worship were erected or enlarged; vacant congregations were supplied with ministers from Scotland, and an attempt was made to secure a home education for the clergy, by establishing what was called a 'Philosophy School,' at Killeleagh, county Down. These symptoms of prosperity vexed the prelates of the Established church, and they resolved to invoke the civil power to put a check to it. In 1698, Bishop Walkington sent a petition to the government, which was an indictment against the dissenters of his diocese. He complains of the 'unreasonable liberty' taken by the ministers and elders, in proceeding 'to exercise discipline openly and with a high hand' over those of their own persuasion. They had also the audacity 'to celebrate the office of matrimony,' and even 'to celebrate the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in congregations so formidably numerous, by gathering the inhabitants of ten or twelve or more parishes together in one place, where they preach in the fields, and continue there a great part of the day together.' Another grievance was that they openly held 'their sessions and provincial synods for regulating all matters of ecclesiastical concern, and had set up at Killeleagh a Philosophy School, in open violation and contempt of the laws.'

The distressed bishop therefore humbly prays that their Excellencies the Lords Justices 'would be pleased to undeceive these forward men, by putting such a stop to the liberties that they assume as your lordships think most convenient for the good of the kingdom, and the safety and honour of the established religion.' (p. 70.) The Lords Justices were not at this time disposed to humour such sensitive bigotry. Two of the Presbyterian clergy were examined touching the petition of the bishop, and were dismissed without censure, only they were requested to exhort their people to behave 'respectfully' towards the church, and the bishops were exhorted 'to carry moderately.'

The eighteenth century opened with gloomy prospects for the Irish dissenters. The executive was hostile, one of the Lords Justices being an archbishop. The prosecutions in the bishops' courts, on account of marriages, multiplied to such a degree that the synod were obliged to make repeated appeals to the government, with diminished hopes of success. While matters were in this state, their great protector, King William, died. 'No heavier blow,' says Dr. Reid, 'could have fallen upon the cause of toleration and the interests of the Presbyterian church in Ireland than the death of this truly great man. By no party in Ireland was his loss more sincerely deplored than by the Presbyterians. Though the paramount influence of an intolerant faction defeated most of his plans in their favour, yet his very name was felt to be a tower of strength on their side, of which their opponents now rejoiced to see them deprived.' (p. 84.)

The High Church party were filled with hopes that they could now trample the dissenters under foot; exclude them from all offices by means of a Test act; put down their worship by law; and deprive their ministers of the *regium donum*. Hence their old enemy, Dr. King, was busy at this crisis. As soon as he heard of the king's death he wrote to the Bishop of Clogher, then in London, proposing that if the grant could not be withdrawn, it might at least be made the instrument of subjugation and division. 'The government,' he said, 'ought to keep the disposal of the fund in their own hands, and encourage those only by it that would comply as they would have them. By which means every particular minister would be at their mercy; and it might be so managed as to be an instrument of division and jealousy amongst them.'

A few days after, he earnestly pressed this plan for weakening and degrading the Presbyterian cause upon the attention of Sir Robert Southwell, the secretary for Ireland. In this letter he accuses the dissenters of keeping up their numbers by a system of exclusive dealing, and of carrying their sectarian partiality into juries. With regard to the *regium donum*, he said that

some of the most eminent of their ministers were trustees for it, which created a sort of dependence of the rest upon them, and enabled them to manage their affairs by joint councils, for these were a general committee and centre of unity for their whole body. 'They employed this money to settle meetings throughout the whole kingdom, and by this they maintained their emissaries till they had seduced enough to support their teachers. By this means, the most busy, factious persons had the best shares. But I hope,' he adds, 'this will fail them for the future, or if it be continued, it will be put into good hands, that will give it to the most humble, peaceable, and complying, and some good use may be made of such contrivance if it must be continued.' The bishop goes on to complain of the increasing insolence of the dissenters, stating that they had insulted both clergy and laity by bringing church offices into contempt, particularly by presuming to celebrate marriage! He then relates a story about a meeting-house which they had unroofed because the landlord had ejected the congregation for want of title. Dr. Reid has proved that this was a calumny, and in the rest of his statements there was no doubt much falsehood and exaggeration. As to the *regium donum*, it had been up to that time divided in equal shares among the ministers, so that every new congregation made each man's share less. That new congregations were encouraged by influential ministers, under such circumstances, must be regarded as some proof of a missionary spirit; for in later times the Synod of Ulster steadily opposed any addition to the number of the ministers. However, the Machiavellian policy recommended by Dr. King was adopted when Queen Anne renewed the grant. The power of allocating the amount among the ministers was now withdrawn from the trustees and transferred to the Lord Lieutenant, who was empowered to administer it in *such portions and to such ministers as he pleased*. The grant was accordingly no longer entered on the Irish establishment in this form—'To the Presbyterian ministers,' as it had appeared during the previous reign. It henceforth stood thus—'To be distributed among *such* of the nonconforming ministers, by warrant from the Lord Lieutenant, or other chief governor or governors for the time being, in such manner as he or they shall find necessary for *our service* or the good of that kingdom.' In this form the grant was an undisguised bribe to secure political subserviency and respectful demeanour towards the established church. The humiliating position of the recipients may be inferred from the fact that the Lord Lieutenant was then seldom in Ireland, and that the country was governed by Lords Justices; one, and the most influential of whom was always a bishop, Dr. King himself having filled the post for many years.

Dr. Reid, however, says, 'There is no reason to believe that any real change in its mode of distribution took place, or that any attempt was made to interfere with the independence of individual ministers by means of this alteration. It appears to have been distributed to all the ministers in equal portions as before this change, the government declining the invidious responsibility which was sought to be imposed on it for the base and sinister purposes of Bishop King.' (p. 89.)

The Presbyterians continued to increase in numbers; a better education of the ministers was required, and all were obliged to sign the Westminster Confession of Faith. But the reign of Anne, who resigned herself to the guidance of the High Church party, was a period of tribulation to all who were opposed to that party in Ireland. In 1703, the oath of abjuration was extended to that country, and by a solecism in legislation enforced upon 'all preachers of separate congregations,' though such parties in Ireland had yet no existence in the eye of the law, but were positively prohibited by statute under severe penalties. This involved some of the ministers in difficulties, because, though loyal enough to the queen, they were not prepared to swear to a matter of fact of which they could know nothing, namely, that the Pretender was not the son of the late King James II. In the following year, a committee of the Irish House of Commons recommended that two of the Presbyterian nonjurors should be deprived of the *regium donum*, and in a few days later the House itself resolved—'That the pension of £1200 granted to the Presbyterian ministers in Ulster is an unnecessary branch of the establishment.' As King was now Archbishop of Dublin, and very active in carrying out his designs, this resolution may be ascribed to his influence. But the government did not think it prudent to act on it, and the grant was continued. The effect of such resolutions held *in terrorem* over the heads of the Presbyterian clergy may be easily imagined.

The rampant High Church party now began to forge chains for all who would not submit to the bishops, and pass under the yoke of the church. We quote with satisfaction the following liberal sentiments from Dr. Reid on this subject:—

'The Roman Catholics were first to feel the effects of the prevalent spirit. They had already suffered much, in direct violation of the Treaty of Limerick; but it is from the commencement of this reign that that iniquitous series of anti-popery laws began which have been the source of so much misery to Ireland, and the mischievous effects of which, though now happily repealed, are still to be traced in many of the social evils of that ill-governed land, as, though these most unjust and oppressive laws were passed for the sake of the Established Church, yet the Presbyterians were so blinded by the headstrong and unreason-

ing anti-papal spirit of those days as to concur but too cordially in their enactment. And it was a singular occurrence—an instance perhaps of righteous requital—that they themselves, after having given their aid in parliament to carry one of the most cruel of these statutes against the Romanists, should, by a clause added to that very statute, be deprived of their own civil rights, and subjected in their turn to serious grievances on account of their religion.’—p. 97.

In the shape in which the act in question received the support of the Presbyterians, it applied exclusively to Roman Catholics, and its provisions were most oppressive and unjustifiable. But when the heads of the bill were transmitted to London, a clause was there added, which excluded the Presbyterians from all civil offices, and from the corporations, as well as from the army, navy, militia, excise, customs, post-office, &c., by the application of the sacramental test. Such were the provisions of an act, avowedly ‘to prevent the growth of popery.’ The Presbyterians were justly requited for their intolerance.

‘—— Nec lex est æquior ulla,
Quam necis artifices arte perire sua.’

It was urged in the House of Commons on behalf of the dissenters, that they had served the Protestant cause at Enniskillen and Derry, and that it was unjust to deprive them of their civil rights, and dangerous to put them out of capacity to defend the country in case of foreign invasion. But Sir Edward Southwell, the Irish secretary, writing to the Earl of Nottingham, naïvely remarks—‘All these matters were very sufficiently answered, and showed that *no particular hardship* was designed towards them; that, in fact, there were more of the church at Enniskillen, and at least one half at Derry, that even in the north, above eight in ten of the gentry were churchmen,’ &c. (p. 104.)

The Presbyterian members were immediately turned out of the corporations. In Derry no fewer than ten out of twelve aldermen, and fourteen out of twenty-four burgesses, resigned their offices. Most of the magistrates throughout Ulster were in like manner deprived of their commissions. There was the greatest difficulty found in supplying their places; so much, that ‘men of little estates, youths, new comers, having nothing to recommend them to the dignity of magistrates but their going to church,’ were placed in the commission of the peace. Daniel Defoe, then a prisoner in Newgate for his inimitable satire, ‘The Shortest Way with the Dissenters,’ published a pamphlet on the treatment of the Irish dissenters, with the sarcastic title—‘The Parallel; or, Persecution of Protestants the Shortest Way to prevent the Growth of Popery in Ireland.’ ‘It seems somewhat hard,’ says the witty confessor of freedom, ‘and savours of the most scandalous ingratitude, that the very people who drink deepest of the

popish fury, and were the most vigorous to show both their zeal and their courage, in opposing tyranny and popery, and on the foot of whose forwardness and valour the Church of Ireland recovered herself from her low condition, should now be requited with so injurious a treatment as to be linked with those very papists they fought against.' Referring to an observation of Archbishop King, in 1691, that the dissenters' liberality to the episcopal clergy when impoverished by the war, 'ought to be remembered to their honour,' Defoe very pointedly remarks, 'that instead of being remembered to their honour, they have been ranked amongst the worst enemies to the Church, and chained to a bill to prevent the growth of popery. This will certainly be no encouragement to the dissenters to join with their brethren the next time that papists shall please to take arms, and attempt their throats. Not but they may perhaps be fools enough, *as they always were*, to stand in the gap.' Towards the conclusion of the pamphlet, he asks—'Will any man in the world tell us that to divide the Protestants is a way to prevent the further growth of popery, when their united force is little enough to keep it down? This is like sinking the ship to drown the rats, or cutting off the foot to cure the corns. This would merit some satire, if the case was not really too sad and serious to bear a banter.' (Reid, p. 108.)

During the next session of parliament, the most influential of the dissenters presented a humble petition for the repeal of the clause which deprived them of their civil rights. There was a debate on the question whether the petition should be kicked out or be allowed to lie on the table. It was ultimately agreed that it should lie on the table, but that no notice should be taken of it in the printed notes. In the meantime, the bishops were busy prosecuting the dissenters for sundry offences against their authority, among which was the new one of working on the episcopal holidays. In reference to the 'Philosophy School' at Killeleagh, the only seminary the dissenters had in Ireland, the enlightened Irish Commons resolved as follows:—'That the erecting and continuing any seminary for the instruction and education of youth in principles contrary to the Established Church and government, tends to create and perpetuate *misunderstandings among protestants!*' How stupid and brutal must have been the bigotry that dictated such a resolution, after the same party had denuded half the Protestants of the kingdom of their civil rights, by making them the objects of the penal code against Roman Catholics! Another resolution, which the Commons adopted at the instigation of the bishops, was designed to crush the loyal ministers, who had conscientious objections to the oath of abjuration:—'Resolved, that preaching or teaching

in separate congregations by persons who have not taken the oath of abjuration, and hearing, maintaining, and countenancing such persons, tends to defeat the succession of the crown in the Protestant line, and to encourage and advance the interest of the pretended Prince of Wales.' Fortunately for the Irish dissenters, the English administration discouraged this rabid intolerance, and protected its objects as far as it was in their power; for they were often obliged to yield in some measure, in order to get the queen's business done, and the supplies voted by the bigots of the Irish parliament. Two-thirds of the Commons were then frantic high churchmen; all the bishops were as high as Laud. They often constituted a majority of the Upper House, and nearly all the temporal lords were under their influence.

Among the most violent of the opponents of the dissenters was Dean Swift, who was indeed violent in everything he undertook. He was a strenuous advocate of the exclusive system, by which a handful of Episcopalians monopolized all the power, offices, and emoluments of the state. In one of his tirades he instituted the following complimentary comparison between the Roman Catholics and the Presbyterians:—'Tis agreed among naturalists that a lion is a larger, a stronger, and more dangerous enemy than a cat; yet if a man were to have his choice, either a lion at his foot, bound fast with three or four chains, his teeth drawn out, and his claws pared to the quick, or an angry cat in full liberty at his throat, he would take no long time to determine.' (p. 127.)

In 1709, the Lord Lieutenant ventured to hint to the Irish parliament in the speech from the throne, that some relief should be given to the dissenters. To this the lords, composed of twelve bishops and ten lay lords, replied with the coolest impudence as follows:—'All our fellow subjects are treated with so much *tenderness*, that we hope they never will have just reason to complain of any uneasiness.' Shortly after this several ministers were cast into prison for preaching without episcopal licence.

In the year 1710 was established the General Fund, which was the subject of litigation a few years ago. It was instituted 'for the support of religion in and about Dublin and the south of Ireland, by assisting and supporting the protestant dissenting interest against unreasonable prosecutions (some of which they have lately been exposed to, contrary to her Majesty's sentiments publicly declared), and for the education of youth designed for the ministry among protestant dissenters, and for assisting protestant dissenting congregations that are poor and unable to provide for their ministers.' The trustees were the subscribers and the ten ministers of the five dissenting congregations then exist-

ing in Dublin (all being 'collegiate charges'), and two laymen from each, to be succeeded by the ministers of those congregations for the time being, and two laymen from each, chosen by ballot. Large sums were contributed to this fund by Sir Arthur Langford, Bart., Lady Loftus, Joseph Damer, Esq., the Rev. Daniel Williams, of London, and others. For many years it was the means of sustaining a number of congregations in the south of Ireland.

The more power the bishops obtained over the Presbyterians, the more they were aggrieved at their undutiful behaviour. On the 6th of November, 1711, a committee, consisting of of thirteen bishops, headed by Archbishop King, and eleven lords, was appointed 'to draw up a representation and address to the Queen's Majesty, relating to the dissenting ministers.' They complained that the 'gentle usage' of their chained victims, which they had paternally exercised towards them, 'under many and repeated provocations, had been repaid with evil;' and that their forbearance had only increased 'the rage and obstinacy of those men.' They were undermining the Church and disturbing the peace and unanimity of conformists. One of their ministers had the hardihood to justify synods, and make them independent of the civil power. They therefore suggested, as the only remedy for these intolerable evils, that her Majesty would be graciously pleased to withdraw the royal bounty. Their lordships concluded their deliberations with an *auto da fé*. On the closing day of the session they ordered a volume of the Rev. Mr. Boyse's sermons, containing one on the office of bishop, to be ignominiously burned before the Moloch of Dublin, by the common hangman, on the ground that it was 'false and scandalous, and contained matters highly reflecting on the legislature and on the episcopal order.' The two houses of convocation drew up a similar address, calling for the withdrawal of *regium donum*, which they said was the means of multiplying fanatical preachers, and promoting faction and schism.

In a petition replying to these charges, in 1712, the dissenters allege that 'of late years the renewal of leases is refused to divers Presbyterian lessees; and in many leases of church and college lands, there are clauses inserted, prohibiting, under great penalties, the building or continuing of meeting houses, and that presbyterian inhabitants should dwell upon the premises; some whereof have been severely executed already, to the great prejudice and expense of many of your faithful subjects, and will ruin divers of our settled congregations, unless your Majesty shall see it meet in your great clemency to divert the severity of these proceedings.' (p. 151.) These ecclesiastical 'evictions' were persevered in for a long time, with a view to the extermination of the

dissenters. Multitudes of them were, besides, prosecuted in the Church courts, for living 'in fornication,' because they were not married by the clergy of the Church, only by their own ministers. But it is a curious and characteristic fact, as showing the sordid spirit of the persecutors, that the parochial clergy demanded and obtained fees for all the marriages performed in their parishes by the dissenting ministers.

Such was the spirit of Queen Anne's government throughout her whole reign. Its effects in Ireland were such that many of the most industrious of the Presbyterians emigrated to America and the West Indies, unable to bear the pressure of tyranny, coupled with exorbitant rents and tithes, which reduced even the Ulster tenantry to poverty and suffering. In some places the oppressors went so far as to seize presbyterian catechisms and other books when exposed for sale, and to nail up the houses of worship. (p. 182.) This system was terminated by the death of the queen. The accession of George I. brought with it a total change of parties: the whigs came into power, and proved friendly to the protestant dissenters. The *regium donum*, which had been withdrawn, was restored, and the penal laws were not enforced, while acts of indemnity were passed to save dissenters from the penalties of the Test Act incurred by having served in the militia. A fruitless effort was made to repeal this oppressive law. But the Church was too strong in the Lords to allow such a relief to be granted. The Commons, in which there was now a majority of whigs, unable to do more, passed the following resolution:—'Resolved, *nem. con.*, that such of his Majesty's protestant dissenting subjects of this kingdom as have taken commissions in the militia, &c., have hereby done a seasonable service to his Majesty's royal person and government, and the protestant interest in this kingdom.' An addition of £800 a year was made to the bounty in 1718. The whole sum now gave ten guineas each to the Ulster ministers, and £30 each to those who laboured in the south, as their congregations were smaller and less able to pay. In the year following a bill was passed to exempt the dissenters from certain penalties to which they were exposed, which, strange to say, was supported by six bishops; but our wonder will cease when we learn that five of the six were Englishmen. The historian justly remarks that 'the present generation will scarcely believe that so meagre a boon to Presbyterians as bare permission by law to celebrate their worship, which they were then statedly observing, with scarcely any molestation, should have excited so much opposition from the High Church party, in the face, too, of the express wishes of the sovereign, often repeated. Meagre and unsuitable as it is, it continues to be the charter of religious liberty to the Presbyterians

in Ireland, while, at the same time, it continues to be little more than an obsolete statute.' (p. 230.)

From this time to the close of the century, the history of the presbyterian church in Ireland consists chiefly of a record of struggles and controversies about the Confession of Faith, between 'the subscribers' and 'non-subscribers.' The synod of Ulster had adopted absolute subscription as the law of the Church, but was very lax in enforcing it, while a number of its most talented ministers repudiated subscription to any human creed as unlawful, and its requirement as a violation of religious liberty. Innumerable pamphlets and sermons on the subject were published on both sides, and the discussions greatly agitated the people, who generally identified subscription with orthodoxy, and non-subscription with Arianism, though the non-subscribers earnestly confessed their faith in the Trinity. In 1724, the question was debated in the synod, when there were present 123 ministers and 106 elders. The majority affirmed subscription, but vacillated about carrying out the law, being loath to break their connexion with the non-subscribers, who ultimately separated, and formed the 'Presbytery of Antrim.' Of about fifty publications which the controversy called forth, not one survived the occasion on which they were written.

No sooner were the Presbyterians freed from persecution than they began rapidly to degenerate. Many of their ministers, though signing the Confession, were of doubtful orthodoxy. They had no missionary zeal, no power in the pulpit, and little care for their flocks. Ill-trained for the ministry, and greatly addicted to secular pursuits, they neglected the discipline of the church, and sank with their people into a state of apathy and worldliness. But, towards the middle of the 18th century, the Scotch *Seceders* found their way into Ireland, and, taking advantage of the comparative deadness of the Synod of Ulster, they won over many of the people, and planted numerous congregations; whose ministers afterwards obtained a share of the *regium donum*.

Dr. Killen regards their coming to Ireland at that time as a proof of an overruling and gracious Providence. He says:— 'Few of the wealthier classes joined them, but the common people heard them gladly. They commended themselves by the manifestation of the truth to the hearts and consciences of the multitude. It often happened that those who took an active part in establishing seceding congregations left the communion of the Synod of Ulster with a heavy heart, for it was endeared to them by hallowed recollections; but its fold had been entered by false caretakers, and many could no longer find in it the green pastures and the quiet waters to which faithful shepherds had once guided

them.' (p. 393). Soon after the Seceders came the Covenanters or Cameronians, who were strong protesters against prevailing errors, and raised a high standard of orthodoxy. They never gained much ground in Ireland, and are at present divided into two bodies, who differ on the power of the civil magistrate,—the liberal party having had for their leader the late Rev. Dr. Paul, of Carrickfergus.

It has been computed that, towards the end of the last century, the north of Ireland was, by emigration to America, drained of one-fourth of its trading cash, and a like proportion of its manufacturing people, and the early successes of the Americans against the English arms were owing in large measure to the vigorous exertions and valour of those Irish emigrants, banished by oppression from their own country. The threatened invasion from France, however, and the rise of the Volunteers, wrought a complete change in the spirit of the government. The Irish chief governor wrote, from Dublin Castle, to the English secretary, April 28, 1782,—‘If you delay, or refuse to be liberal, government cannot exist here in its present form, and the sooner you recall your Lord Lieutenant, and renounce all claim to this country, the better.’ The Presbyterians, who formed a majority of the Ulster volunteers, were now to be conciliated. Their marriages were legalized; the Test Act was repealed; and in 1792 the sum of £5000 was added to the bounty. But, while political movements advanced the external prosperity of the church, its spirituality by no means improved. Dr. Killen says, ‘Its records for these fifteen years present very few and dubious indications of its internal prosperity. It may, indeed, safely be asserted, that during the interval between 1778 and 1793, error was avowed by its advocates in presbyterian Ulster with a degree of boldness which they had never hitherto ventured to assume. The greater number of the more prominent members of the general synod did not conceal their aversion to evangelical principles.’ (p. 478). For twenty years preceding 1789 not one congregation was regularly erected, nor would the synod suffer a new erection, without security for the payment of £50 a-year stipend. In about the same period the Seceders had established forty-six congregations. It often happened during the time of the volunteers that political meetings were held on Sunday in the presbyterian meeting houses.

Belfast was then the head quarters of political agitation. The United Irishmen were mostly led by Episcopolians, but many Presbyterians were also involved in the conspiracy. Eight of the ministers of the synod of Ulster were convicted of treasonable practices, and one was executed. Owing to the revolutions in France and America, republicanism became popular in Ulster.

Lord Castlereagh, having determined to effect the Union, saw the importance to government of getting a hold on the presbyterian clergy by means of a larger endowment, more judiciously distributed. There is much interesting correspondence on this subject published by his late brother,—to which we adverted on a former occasion in giving the history of Maynooth College. Dr. Killen does not draw on this correspondence as fully as he might, but he quotes enough to show the purely political motives of the government in increasing the Bounty, and altering the mode of its distribution. He says: 'In a letter written shortly before this period by a British cabinet minister, (the Duke of Portland) to the Lord Lieutenant, it is expressly declared that a *principal object* in increasing and remodelling their allowance was *to make them more dependent, and render them more amenable to the government*. It was thought that the system of classification was pre-eminently calculated to secure this object, as the influential ministers would thus be more largely indebted to the public purse than if the grant were divided according to the existing plan of distribution.' (p. 515). Dr. Killen denies that the political subserviency aimed at has been secured; and maintains that the augmentation of the bounty has greatly strengthened the protestant interest in Ireland, as well as indirectly contributed to the political power of presbyterianism. Yet, while presbyterianism is the creed of nearly half of the Protestants of Ireland, they have never been able to return more than one Presbyterian to represent them in parliament.

According to the new plan, the ministers were to be paid in three classes, first, second, and third, £100, £75, and £50 respectively. The government made another important change. Hitherto, the agent for the distribution was chosen by the synod; now, he was to be *appointed and paid by the government*. Dr. Black, of Derry, the first government agent, got a salary of £400, besides his £100 *regium donum*. Each minister, when appointed, was to send a memorial to the Lord Lieutenant, and two magistrates were to testify that he had taken the oath of allegiance. After some feeble remonstrance, the synod submitted to the new arrangements with reluctance. The addition required for paying according to the new scale was from £8000 to £9000.

In order to justify the government in granting the endowment, Dr. Killen has given statistics from the gaols and workhouses of Ulster, showing that the prisoners and paupers of the Churches of England and Rome are three to one, in proportion to the population of each, as compared with the Presbyterians. This is certainly a remarkable fact, however we are to account for it; and it may be a good argument with statesmen acting on

the ground of political expediency, and aiming to make the Christian ministry 'dependent and amenable to government ;'—but whether it justifies the Christian Church in assuming such a position is another question.

Dr. Reid's 'History' raises some interesting points connected with the history of Irish dissent for the last fifty years, which we have not room to advert to at present, but to which we may soon have an opportunity of returning.

ART. III.—*Collected Edition of the Writings of Douglas Jerrold.* In Eight Volumes. Post 8vo. London: Bradbury and Evans.

SATIRE may almost be said to be indigenous to English literature. It appears in our very earliest written poetry, and in every literary epoch up to the present day it occupies a conspicuous place. We speak of the wits and satirists of the days of Charles II. and Queen Anne, but there is no period in the history of English literature in which these were not prominent. Satire has been, so to speak, as much an element in the genius of almost all our great writers, as humour, or fancy, or imagination. It has employed all these for its own purposes, and wherever the higher attributes of the purely literary mind are manifested we find the satirical. It has been the same with regard to humour. Ever since old Geoffrey Chaucer carolled his mirthful songs, many of them as full of satirical strokes at the shams of his day as others were musical with rich, fresh, joyous feelings, we have never wanted an English humorist. How can we account for this circumstance? Is it because the English nature is more susceptible to the humorous and the satirical than any other? Certainly not. We find the Frenchman as ready to enjoy a joke, as quick to perceive the ludicrous phases of things. Nor is the German's perception and enjoyment of the humorous less notable. Almost all our European neighbours, in fact, possess that relish for the comic in one form or another which would lead to the cultivation of a comic literature. Yet in no case has it produced the same fruit, or, we should rather say, the variety of fruits, to be found in the literature of England. The degree of relish varies in other nations, with us the variety is in the products. Nor is this at all incompatible with seriousness of purpose or an earnest tone of mind. On the contrary, it is indicative in some degree of the prevailing literary spirit of an age. The humorous literature affords, perhaps, a better test of the healthful

character of that spirit than any other. Whatever form it may take, we find in it the evidences of that character, or the opposite, just as readily as we judge of a man's sense of enjoyment by the manner in which he expresses it.

The number of comic writers in our own day, and the place which satire occupies in modern literature, must be held to indicate a more thorough appreciation of the uses of humorous and satirical writing than has previously obtained. It is beyond all question, we think, that the healthiest, and in every sense the best, writers of fiction in our time are not only largely endowed with a keen sense of humour and with a satirical turn of mind, but have, upon the whole, a much higher idea of the purposes which these ought to subserve, than most of their predecessors had. There are comparatively few wickedly witty things written now merely for wit's sake. Let any one glance over the satirical verses, the epigrams and lampoons, written a century ago, with the view of comparing them with the works of our living authors, and we make bold to say that the comparison will be in every way advantageous to the latter. We have but to look over the weekly compendium of witty and yet earnest things given to the world by 'Punch,' in order to see that there is more true human kindness, and far more of a strong moral purpose, manifested by that little crook-backed and hooked-nosed monstrosity, than can be found in the works of the brightest wits of a preceding age. Lightness, flippancy, irreverence sometimes, and that *penchant* for punning on all subjects there are, it is true; but we find no bad inuendoes, no poison on the sting of wit, and we find a good deal that does better service in the cause of humanity than things of far more weight and pretension. The witty profanities of a Congreve, or the more powerful and dangerous ones of a Swift, would not be tolerated now, it may be urged, and our modern comic writers are therefore kept within bounds by the taste and morality of the age. True, but do we owe these writers nothing for helping to set up those bounds and make them permanent by proving that the shafts of satire are better employed when shot against social evils or political abuses, than when they were made instruments of personal spleen or party squabbles. In short, the wits and satirists, at the head of whom we place a Dickens, a Thackeray, and a Douglas Jerrold, are entitled to take as high a rank in the scale of intellect as the most lauded of their predecessors, while they unquestionably claim a far higher one on the score of morality.

Of these three writers Douglas Jerrold is least known to the general reader. It would seem as if the atmosphere of London life, which pervades so many of his works, had in a measure absorbed him, and that even in it he appears only in one or other

of his literary phases, for we believe there is no author of equal ability whose writings are so little known in the general community, and none whose merely comic writings are more heartily appreciated in London society. With the reputation of an inveterate and almost unrivalled punster among those who know him, yet with scarcely a single pun in his works; with a character for comicality, yet with far more of the serious and sarcastic than of the purely comic element about him; Jerrold's power as a writer has never been fully known. By some men he is regarded as flippant, by others as sardonic. One class objects to him on the score of his political prejudices, while another considers him to be a cynic, with more than the cynicism of Diogenes.

Mr. Jerrold occupies a position somewhat different from that of most contemporary writers of equal or even greater eminence. His works, in point of subject and style, as well as in respect of their peculiarities of thought and their moral bearing, represent some of the leading characteristics of the literary mind more thoroughly than those of any other author who has written things of a similar character. It is not only the combination of wit and humour, with deep feeling and earnest thinking, that gives them the uniqueness which we allude to, for some of his contemporaries greatly excel him in the finer and purer qualities of humour. In the works of Thackeray, however, where satire is at least as prominent as it is in those of Jerrold, we are continually reminded of Fielding, and in those of Dickens only the lighter kinds of humour are brought out in combination with a poetic expression of feeling. With Jerrold the satire is always marked by a certain everyday character, and invariably suggests something within the range of everyday experience. The feeling expressed in his works is quite as free from any approach to sentimentality as that of Thackeray, and although it is by no means so genial, or likely to be so generally effective, as that of Dickens, yet we are disposed to think that it is deeper than that of either. There is a more sternly practical character about all Jerrold's writings than we have been able to find in those of any modern author in the same departments of literature. He seems to us a man much more intimately acquainted with the varied aspects of city life than most of his contemporaries, and as a distinguishing feature,—more marked, perhaps, than any other,—all that he writes is highly coloured by strong and decided political opinions. Hence we find that he has never been more successful than when employing fictitious incidents and ludicrous circumstances to express his scorn of hollow conventionalities either in social usages or political dogmas. His wit is never brought into play for the mere sake of seeming witty; his arrows are always pointed, and pointed, too, with a cutting sharpness. Shot with

that directness of aim which he gives them, they never fail to pierce wherever they hit.

Mr. Jerrold's reputation, as we have already hinted, has suffered in no small degree from circumstances connected with his literary position. That position has associated him with men who are greatly his inferiors even as comic writers, and has moreover identified him with literature necessarily and naturally fugitive in its character. To such readers as are familiar with the works of all our best novelists, he is known only as one in whom the spirit of 'Punch' is as it were incarnated, as the author of the inimitable 'Caudle Lectures,' or certain comedies strictly of the modern stamp. Almost all that he has written, in fact, was originally placed before the public in the pages of periodicals; and from this very circumstance it has been in a great measure deprived of that prominence which a book published with its author's name, and in a permanent form, obtains, when it is at all worthy of being regarded as superior to the mass of three volumed insipidities which the press pours forth from year to year. It is because we are of opinion that Mr. Jerrold's works contain things of permanent interest that we feel gratified by the appearance of the collected edition now before us. We could have wished, indeed, that some things less valuable than the others, even at the time they were first published, had been excluded from the collection, and that in some places extreme opinions, or strong expressions, which the author's subsequent experience must have corrected; but we welcome the volumes as the means of making the public more thoroughly acquainted with their author's great and varied abilities. It is not for such as merely enjoy the excitement which fiction produces, and who value it on that account alone, that we conceive these abilities to have been exercised. The moral purpose of Mr. Jerrold's writings is very evident even in cases where the comic phase of his literary character comes out most fully; and in reviewing that character as it is displayed in these volumes, we shall take occasion to claim for him the attention and consideration of a far larger class than that which is composed of mere novel readers. We do not, of course, profess to regard Mr. Jerrold as other than what he is—namely, a writer of fiction in one form or another; but, conceiving the aim of the novelist to be much higher than that of simply producing something which gives pleasure without any, or at least with no very direct reference to the moral perceptions or the intellectual faculties of the reader, we shall endeavour to examine his claims on the consideration of those by whom books are read with a fixed purpose rather than as affording a transitory pleasure.

Although Mr. Jerrold has been regarded rather too exclusively

as a comic writer and a wit, that phase of him is undoubtedly the most prominent one. The serious, earnest nature of the man is seen in his broadly comic writings almost as plainly as in those of a graver and more reflective character. In such things as the 'Caudle Lectures,' it is true, the pungency of the wit, the success with which certain social or domestic features are hit off, and the artistic conception and consistency of the whole are most notable, and suffice to render them unique. The moral tendency, where it is seen at all, is much less apparent than it is even in some of his other and less successful comic writings. It is inserted here and there more by suggestion than direct expression, and the nature of the productions is not such as to give it any weight. But for its unique character, and the flashes of wit which it contains, we should have been disposed to regard this part of Mr. Jerrold's writings as belonging rather to the fugitive or ephemeral order. These things, however, combined with the air of reality thrown around them by an artistic treatment unsurpassed in his more serious compositions, have given an interest to the 'Curtain Lectures' which revives with every fresh perusal. In thoroughly comic character, Mr. Jerrold has produced nothing so complete as 'Mrs. Caudle.' His 'Job Pippins, the man who could not help it;' 'Barnaby Palms, the man who felt his way;' and 'Perditus Mutton,' in 'Cakes and Ale,' are all as natural in their way as the 'Dick Swivellers,' and 'Captain Cuttles,' of Charles Dickens; or the 'Costigans' and 'Jeamses' of Thackeray; but we have an impression that the author's predilection for making his characters appear as representatives of his own ironical views of life tends in some degree to mar the comic effect of such characters. With Jerrold, wit and humour, whether expressed in impersonation, or in his own descriptions, are never made use of without a very apparent aim; while, in the case of the other writers we have mentioned, they come out broadly of themselves, suggesting rather than urging the moral. Several of the tales in the 'Men of Character,' and in 'Cakes and Ale,' contain passages of what we may be permitted to call pure and gratuitous fun; but it is not in these that we find the best specimens of Mr. Jerrold's comic manner. The satirist invariably prevails over the artist, and even in his most playful moods it is impossible for him to write a page without dashing into it some stinging sarcasm. 'Punch's Letters to his Son,' those singularly felicitous imitations of Lord Chesterfield's 'Letters,' in spite of all their comicality, are satirical from beginning to end. The text of each is taken from social shams and follies, and it is so with almost everything Mr. Jerrold has written, if we except his plays, which seem to have been composed for the most part on the principle of enjoying and communicating the enjoyment of drollery.

It is as a satirist, then, rather than as a comic writer, in the plain acceptation of the term, that we must consider Mr. Jerrold—as one, in short, who makes his comic vein subservient to the purposes of satire. Here, again, we approach more nearly to the serious part of his writings; for, generally speaking, the sharpness and brilliancy of the wit brought to bear on prevailing follies point too directly to their object to admit of our losing sight of it. It has been said by an Eastern poet, that the flash of Saladin's scimeter, like the lightning, revealed the form of the foe he struck. This is precisely the case with Mr. Jerrold's wit. It plays momentarily around its object, showing in a lurid light its moral deformity, or its formal hollowness, and then strikes it with a withering stroke. All vain and pompous conventionalities are stripped bare, and in its pitiless scathing force it often rends away the good, at least the necessary, with the evil and the hypocritical. All worldly distinctions—all the forms and shows of things—are to Mr. Jerrold so many masks which he must tear off and show the abstract thing, the living, practical reality behind. And in most cases what is thus exposed assumes more than its natural character, from the very means taken to expose it. It is not to be denied, however, that while Mr. Jerrold's satire is sometimes rather grim, it has on the whole a healthful character: it is never directed against things which will bear a close moral scrutiny, or which are in any way allied to the nobler feelings and motives of humanity. His warmest sympathies are with the poor, and his sarcasm is never more pitiless than when it is directed against those prejudices which arise from differences of social position. His most contemptible characters are invariably those whose sole claim to the position they occupy rests upon titles or wealth. He detects and exposes with merciless severity the meanness, the cupidity, and the vices which obtain in high places. In doing this, we know not but that he may be considered as in some degree responsible for the existence of a class of literary productions in which all that is vile and criminal is ascribed to the aristocracy, the tendency of which, unredeemed by a single spark of literary ability, is at once injurious to the moral health and the intellectual character of those who read them. Mr. Jerrold's design is to show that no extent of worldly influence, and no amount of worldly substance, can be in any sense productive of aught but evil to the possessor unless these are exercised and employed in accordance with the dictates of morality and an enlightened sense of social duty. His noble *roués*, women of fashion, and hard-hearted millionaires, are all set forth as illustrations of a departure from these things encouraged by the false and hollow usages of society. His teaching on such points is founded on no

ultra-democratic and ignorant prejudices against those classes from which such illustrations are selected. It takes the form, not of invective, or of the exposure of vice for the mere exposure's sake, as is the case with the writings of some who have adopted the characters while altogether mistaking the tendency, of his,—but of warmly eloquent pleadings, and vigorous arguments in behalf of popular education, an extension of political rights, and other measures of social improvement. The principles and tests which he applies to individual character are in most cases precisely similar to those on which he judges of abuses in society, and the means of reforming them. Such being the general scope of his works, it is scarcely necessary to say that he is a firm believer in the doctrine of progress. He is perhaps the ablest and most energetic exponent in his own literary walk, of the more advanced views of that doctrine. Full as his writings are of fine chivalric sentiment, and the admiration of nobleness in all ranks of life, he has no sympathy with those who conceive that progress has not been made in all that is conducive to social well-being.

Mammon is the object of Mr. Jerrold's special hatred. Against it he has brought to bear all the force of his sarcasm, all the scathing power of his scorn. There are few of his books in which his indignant protest against the worship of the Golden Calf is not put forth either as the entire ground-work of a story, in some character of it, or in the name given to such a character. One of his most recent and perhaps least known works, 'The Man made of Money,' proceeds wholly on the ground of the retribution which follows an indulgence of avaricious propensities, and by incidents sometimes of the most telling and effective character, but often wildly extravagant, it expresses its author's ideas of the miseries arising from that inordinate love of gain which he seems in the strictest sense to consider the root of all evil. The hero of it, Mr. Solomon Jericho, bored by the importunities of his spouse, and environed by difficulties such as will beset a man of limited means and large desires, breathes an unholy wish that he was made of money, and he becomes so. He undergoes a physical change. All that is necessary for the drawing of a bank note is that he should place his hand upon his heart; withdrawing it, the money, to any amount he may wish, adheres to his palm. In process of time he becomes great in the world's esteem; lives luxuriously; purchases an estate, and surrounds himself with all the magnificence which money can procure. The retribution comes, however; he eventually finds that the wealth being a part of himself, the more he draws from his mysterious bank the faster his corporeal frame diminishes in bulk. He is reduced to a living skeleton. A facetious friend sees the sunset through Mr. Jericho's

ribs. Avarice in its worst form overtakes him, and he becomes a miser shut out from all society, and surrounded only by the fruits of his unholy wish. Ultimately he is consumed while about to light a candle with a bank note; all his substance; all the jewels worn by his wife and daughters; all the gifts bestowed upon his friends, are transformed into soot and charcoal.

Mr. Jerrold has drawn too strongly on the intelligence of his readers in this tale. In his wish to give the moral of it an extraordinary force, he has overstepped altogether not only the bounds of probability, for in certain circumstances that might have been admissible, but the very wide bound allowed to the writer of fiction. His purpose in the story is weakened by the very efforts made to give it an additional strength, and the consequence is, that where we ought to have had the impressive we have simply the horrible. Nor is this the only offence against good taste which this tale manifests; there are passages of it which cannot be justified by any reference to the moral aim which the writer has had in view—passages in which, as it seems to us, there is an unnecessary exhibition of the evils which he designs to expose, and what is much worse, a resort to melodramatic effects, and language as offensive as it is uncalled for. As a whole, then, we consider 'The Man made of Money' the least successful of Mr. Jerrold's works. The purpose of it comes out far more distinctly, because more naturally, and with greater effect, in some of his other works. The tendency to make too much of the moral designed to be conveyed in the story is apparent, it is true, in each of these, so apparent sometimes as almost to make us think that Mr. Jerrold considers money in its very abstract an evil, and poverty a virtue rather than a necessity; but delicacies of feeling and beauties of expression, not less than a clear and piercing irony, give a healthier and higher tone to the means by which the moral is brought out. Thus in one of his satirical essays, 'The Order of Poverty,' we have such passages as this:—

'Will it not be a merry time when men with a blithe face and open look shall confess that they are poor? When they shall be to the world what they are to themselves? . . . Look at this peasant. His face bronzed with mid-day toil. From sunrise to sunset, with cheerful looks and uncomplaining words, he turns the primal curse to dignity, and manfully earns his bread by the sweat of his brow. . . . And here is a white-haired shepherd. As a boy, a child playful as the lambs he tended, he laboured. He has dreamed away his life upon hill-sides, on downs, on solitary heaths. The humble, simple, patient watcher for fellow-man. Solitude has been his companion: he has grown old and wrinkled, bent in the eye of the burning sun. His highest wisdom is a guess at the coming weather; he may have heard of diamonds,

but he knows the evening star. He is to our mind a most reverent Knight of the Fleece.'—p. 169.

This has the merit of being well expressed, pathetic, and not lacking a certain calm poetic feeling. Mr. Jerrold must know, however, that the existence of such a shepherd does not necessarily infer an evil arising from the unequal distribution of worldly wealth. What, to such a man as this, would the riband and star of knighthood, or the riches of a kingdom, be? He fills his place in the great economy of life: the lords of heraldic orders or successful worldly enterprise, who so often provoke Mr. Jerrold's scorn, do no more. Theirs is, in most cases, a lot which the shepherd, nay, perhaps the workhouse pauper, need not envy. 'The great Soul of the world is just,' and still of him to whom much is given much shall also be required—much in misery for misspent means of doing good—much in the extortion of that bitter avowal that the fashion of this world passeth away. Such, in effect, is the moral of those tales in which Mr. Jerrold sets forth the wretched and contemptible character of avarice: when he pushes that moral beyond its application to the responsibilities devolving on the rich in regard to the poor, making the mere possession of riches something like a moral blemish, he pushes it too far.

If, however, the reader would form a correct opinion respecting the true character of our author's genius, for genius of a high order he undoubtedly possesses, he should read 'St. Giles and St. James,' and 'The Story of a Feather.' These are his most important, and we may perhaps add, his most finished works. In both, the serious as well as the comic phase of his mind is seen to advantage, and his peculiar vein of sarcasm runs through both. Of these two books, the first is, in some respects, the most successful. It has an artistic completeness which the subject of the other scarcely requires; it contains some of its author's finest thoughts, and most of those peculiarities or prejudices which have occasionally subjected him to adverse criticism. The nature of the subject is briefly stated in the Preface. 'It has been my endeavour,' says Mr. Jerrold, 'to show in the person of St. Giles, the victim of an ignorant disregard of the social claims of the poor upon the rich; of the governed millions upon the governing few; to present the picture of the infant pauper, reared in brutish ignorance; a human waif of dirt and darkness.'

Now, it has been asserted—and the reader of limited knowledge respecting those features of city life which it has been the novelist's object to delineate, may probably consider the assertion a just one,—that Mr. Jerrold has magnified the evils arising from social distinctions, overstated the claims of the poor, and over-

drawn the picture of their misery. There is undoubtedly a tendency, in all his more serious writings, to make the most of the responsibilities of the rich; but that he can be charged with giving a false colour to the virtues of the poor, or of exaggerating the evils arising from ignorance, no one who reads the story to which we now refer with anything like the attention which it deserves, will, we think, be disposed to admit. If the standard of duty by which wealth and worldly influence are measured is a high one, higher than in strict justice it ought to be, the error is certainly an error on the safe side. A man need not live very long in the world to learn alike from experience and observation, that selfishness and the conventional usages of society are inimical in the main to a right discharge of those duties which devolve upon the possessors of worldly influence or wealth. Mr. Jerrold has done no more in this novel than exhibit in the light in which a writer of fiction is permitted to do so, the effect of a neglect of such duties. He has shown at once the demoralizing nature of an indulgence of the selfish principle, and the evil thereby entailed on those who are the victims of the neglect of duty consequent on that indulgence. In so doing, he has only more forcibly exhibited truths obvious enough to all, than is quite palatable to those whom they more immediately concern, and has in effect done no more than has been done by other writers. Nor do we think he can be charged with exaggerating the evils of our social system,—of such ignorance as is illustrated in the character of St. Giles. We doubt if exaggeration is possible in such a case. Mr. Jerrold has seen, and any one acquainted with city life must have seen, cases in which natural acuteness and energy have, from the neglect of what is due to the young of all ranks in society, been turned against society. The ignorance of the class typified by St. Giles is precisely the kind which education and the proper discharge of social responsibilities are most likely to meet. In one sense, it cannot be called ignorance at all; for it consists of a knowledge which the wisdom of senates has not yet been able to checkmate,—a knowledge of the worst things in the world, of the craft and crime which fill our prisons, and go far to shake our faith in the possibility of ever dispensing with them.

Almost as a natural consequence of the opinions which he entertains regarding the evils arising from a false estimate of worldly character and position, or from the neglect and misery which such an estimate involves, are Mr. Jerrold's views respecting national prosperity and national glory. The hollowness which, in his estimation, destroys or renders positively pernicious the ideal of life in the individual, has exactly the same effect as regards the nation. Hence his almost republican idea of everything which constitutes mere external pomp, or which exists for

purposes of parade. Hence also his denunciations of war and his scorn of martial glory. Long ere the Peace Society was constituted, years before the principles on which it was founded had met with anything like the acceptation they now receive directly or indirectly, Mr. Jerrold employed his genius in the condemnation of war—in ridiculing as well as deploring its results, and in satirizing all manifestations of the martial spirit. He did so not on principles of economy, but from unmistakable motives of humanity. It is 'the folly of the sword,' to borrow the title of one of his most vigorous essays, which awakens his scorn, and the irresponsibility of those in whose hands it is generally placed, which he pities and deplores. A firm believer alike in the inefficacy and barbarity of capital punishments, he regards life and death as things so solemn and so awful, that a devotion of the one to a false and delusive idea of glory, and the association of the other with the horrors of the battle-field, as inimical to all the humanizing and elevating influences of Christianity. It is but just to add, however, that in urging these opinions, Mr. Jerrold seldom if ever descends to the use of such language as is often employed in the condemnation of war. His intelligence, not less than his good taste and generous feeling, restrain him from the fulmination of coarse invectives or sweeping charges against those who have been the agents of what he conceives to be a false idea. Yet, on this as on other subjects which provoke his sarcasm, Mr. Jerrold may very fairly be regarded as taking up a position from which he might be easily driven by weapons of his own forging. He manifests a disposition to take what might be considered too direct a view of an evil,—to look at it too much in the abstract, and without a due consideration of extenuating or justifying circumstances. There is no deduction made for the necessity which constitutes war a punishment as well as 'a pastime for despots;' nothing allowed for the glory, martial though it be, of saving a nation's liberty, even at the expense of its blood and treasure. In such language as the following—language powerful, and, in an abstract view of the subject, just as it is powerful—Mr. Jerrold expresses his ideas of military pomp and action:—

'This dazzling heathenism that makes a pomp of wickedness—seizes and distracts us at the very threshold of life. Swords and drums are our playthings; the types of violence and destruction are made the pretty playthings of our childhood; and, as we grow older, the outward magnificence of the ogre, Glory—his trappings and his trumpets, his privileges and the songs that are shouted in his praise, enslave the bigger baby to the sacrifice. But for craft operating on ignorance, who, in the name of outraged heaven, would become the hireling of the sword? . . . Day by day the sergeant works on the block ploughman,

and at last carves out a true, handsome soldier of the line. What knew Hodge of the responsibility of man? What dreams had he of the self-accountability of the human spirit? The musket-stock which for many an hour he hugs—hugs in weariness—was no more a party to its present use than was Hodge But war brings forth the heroism of the soul; war tests the magnanimity of man. Sweet is the humanity that spares a fallen foe; gracious the compassion that tends his wounds, that brings even a cup of water to his burning lips. Granted. But is there no heroism of a grander mould? The heroism of forbearance? Is not the humanity that refuses to strike, a nobler virtue than the late-born pity of violence? Pretty it is to see the victor with salve and lint kneeling at his bloody trophy—a maimed and agonized fellow-man; but surely it had been better to have withheld the blow, than to have been first mischievous to be afterwards humane.'—pp. 146-7.

We have thus endeavoured briefly to point out some of the more prominent characteristics of Mr. Jerrold's literary character, giving illustrations of what we conceive to be the chief element of it—viz., a serious and earnest nature working with the materials, so to speak, of a comic and satirical writer. It now only remains for us to go over some of his works; and, while exhibiting certain features of his style, endeavour to do so by such quotations as our limits allow.

Although we are disposed to regard Mr. Jerrold as in some respects the most practical of our modern novelists—as giving us, upon the whole, the most ordinary pictures of human life in those aspects in which he looks at it, it would be a great mistake to suppose that his writings are destitute of those expressions of feeling which are, in the strictest sense of the word poetical. While it must be admitted that there is occasionally a tendency towards the use of language and metaphors, which are the very reverse of tasteful or elegant, for the most part his style is clear and terse—singularly so for a writer of such strong feelings, and yet necessarily so, we should be disposed to think, for the effect of his satire. So pregnant and complete are some of his sentences, that it would seem as if in a few words he had struck out a meaning which could not have been better conveyed in a page. This is especially the case in metaphorical passages. Thus, in one of his stories, speaking of the fertility of Australia, he says—'Earth is here so kind that just tickle her with a hoe, and she laughs with harvest.' Again, in the same tale, he thus describes a matter-of-fact man: 'Talk to him of Jacob's ladder, and he would ask the number of the steps.' Characterization could scarcely go farther than this. We have the disposition of the man dashed off in a single line. A shaft of sarcasm, too, is often completed, even to its barbed point, in no more words than we have just quoted. Here is an instance of it—'At that hour

when sparrows look down reproachfully from their eaves at the flushed man trying the street door.' There are few of our modern writers from whose works so many pregnant sentences could be culled as from the volumes before us. They have an epigrammatic clearness and force, an intensity of expression, which renders them in a great measure peculiar. We shall quote a few of these; but in doing so, it is necessary to remind the reader that they lose not a little of their strength by being thus detached. In the opening page of 'St. Giles and St. James,' there is a finely reflective description of a winter night in a great city, which closes with the following lines:—'It was a time when, in the cellars and garrets of the poor, are acted scenes which make the noblest heroism of life; a time when in want and anguish, in throes of mortal agony, some seed is sown that bears a flower in heaven.' The tale from which this sentence is taken abounds with many of its author's finest and most touching thoughts. Here are some of them—full of the finest feeling—

'It was a beautiful spring evening—last of the spring, yet fresh with all its green. The peace of heaven seemed upon earth. An hour and scene when the heart is softened and subdued by the spirit of beauty. One of the happy hours that, sweet in the present are yet delicious in the past; treasured as they are, as somewhat akin to those hours of the world's spring, when earth was trod by angels.'—p. 103.

'There seemed a Sabbath peace on all things. The drudged horse stood meek and passive in the field, patiently eyeing the passer-by, as though it felt secure of one day's holiday; the cows, with their large kind eyes, lay unmoved upon the grass; all things seemed taking rest beneath the brooding wings of heaven. We have climbed the hill—have gained the church-yard; the dust of the living dust of generations. The bell is swinging still; and turning on every side, from distant hamlets we see men, women, and children—age with its staff, and babyhood warm at the breast—all coming upward—upward to the church. Still they climb, and still from twenty opposite paths they come, to strength and rejoice their souls in one common centre—a foreshadowing of that tremendous Sabbath of the Universe when all men from all paths shall meet in Paradise A beautiful sight, doubtless, to behold in that same village temple, men of all conditions gathered together to confess their common infirmities, to supplicate for common blessings, to appear for a time as in the vestibule of eternity in common adoration of the Eternal.'—p. 210.

'How few the incidents of life, how multitudinous its emotions! How flat and monotonous may be the circumstances of daily existence, and yet how various the thoughts which spring from it. Look at yonder landscape, broken into hill and dale, with trees of varied hue and form, and water winding in silver threads through velvet fields. How beautiful, for how varied! Cast your eye over that moor; it is flat and desolate—barren as barren rock. Not so. Seek the soil, and

then with nearer gaze contemplate the wondrous forms and colours of the thousand mosses growing there; give ear to the hum of busy life sounding at every root of forest grass. Listen! Does not the heart of the earth beat audibly beneath this seeming barrenness, audibly as when the corn grows and the grape is ripening? Is it not so with the veriest rich and the veriest poor, with the most active and with apparently the most inert.'—pp. 333, 334.

The love of nature, and of all things beautiful, as evinced in such passages marks, in a greater or less degree, almost every one of Mr. Jerrold's works, except such as are broadly and exclusively comic. He turns aside, as if for relief and refreshment, from the city scenes of misery and the haunts of profligacy, to the quiet of the sunny lanes and the breezy downs of England. His landscapes are all unmistakably English. He cannot think of the country and its peaceful influences, but his mind seems to revert to the wide and open fields, with 'the lark, a trembling and fluttering speck of song, above them.' He brings this love of nature into the dust and din of city streets and murky alleys, too, presenting us, as in the following passage, with quaint reflections on its influence there:—

'Pugwash was fond of what he called nature, though in his dim, close shop he would give her but a stifling welcome. Nevertheless, he had the earliest primroses on his counter; "they threw," he said, "such a nice light about the place." A sly, knavish customer, presented him with a pot of polyanthus, and won by the flowery gift. Pugwash gave the donor ruinous credit. The man with the wall-flowers regularly stopped at the shop, and for sixpence, Pugwash would tell his wife, that he had made the place a Paradise. "If we can't go to nature, Sally, isn't it a pleasant thing to be able to bring nature to us." Whereupon, Mrs. Pugwash would declare that a man, with at least three children to provide for, had no need to talk of nature. Nevertheless, the flowerman made his weekly call. Though at many a house the penny could not every week be spared to buy a hint, a look of nature for the darkened dwellers about him, Isaac, despite of Mrs. Pugwash, always purchased. It is a common thing, an old familiar cry, to see the poor man's florist, and hear his loud-voiced invitation to take his nosegays, his penny roots; and yet it is a call, a conjuration of the heart to a man over-laboured and desponding, walled in by the gloom of a town, divorced from the fields and their sweet, healthful influences, almost shut out from the sky,—it is a call that tells him there are things of the earth beside food and covering to live for; and that God, in his great bounty, hath made them for all men. Adown dark lanes and miry alleys he takes sweet remembrances, touching records of the loveliness of earth, that with their bright looks and balmy odours cheer and uplift the dumpish heart of man; that make his soul stir within him, and acknowledge the beautiful. . . . Amidst the violence, the coarseness, and the suffering that may surround and defile the wretched, there must be moments when the heart

escapes, when the soul makes for itself even of a flower a comfort and a refuge.'—pp. 97, 98.

In these extracts, we have given illustrations almost exclusively of Mr. Jerrold's serious and reflective manner; we have done so from the conviction that the comic and satirical phases of his literary character have been allowed, in some measure, to hide the poetry and pathos with which his works abound. Let us endeavour now to give one or two specimens of his wit and humour. We have already said that Mr. Jerrold is not often witty without being satirical. Humour is less susceptible of an alliance with sarcasm, however, than wit is, and it will therefore be found that, where he lays aside the weapons of the satirist, he is simply humorous. And there is often a richness of fancy and a breadth about his humour which few of his contemporaries have surpassed. This is evinced more fully in the 'Chronicles of Clovernook,' perhaps, than in any of his other works. There is a geniality about it, and on the whole an absence of the author's more extreme opinions, which has always led us to regard it as among his most successful comic writings. Witness the following description of the Hermit of Clovernook, *alias* the Hermit of Bellifull:—

'Altogether he was a massive lump of a man, hard and active. His face was big and round, with a rich larder look about it. His wide red cheeks were here and there jewelled with good living. The hermit had no nose; none, ladies, none. There was a little knob of flesh like a small mushroom dipt in wine, which made its unobtrusive way between the good man's cheeks, and through which he had been known to sneeze; but impudence itself could not call that a nose. The hermit's mouth had all the capacity of large benevolence, large and wide, like an old pocket. There seemed a heavy unctuousness about the lower lip; a weight and drooping from very mellowness, like a rich peach cracking in the sun. His teeth—but that he had lost one, as we afterwards learned, in active service on a Strasburg ham—were regular as a line of infantry, and no less dangerous. . . . The hermit's voice was deep and clear; and he had a sweet, heart-warming chuckle, which came like wine gurgling from a flask.'—p. 9.

The ironical enters so largely into everything of a comic character which Mr. Jerrold has written, that it would be impossible, even did our limits permit, to quote a passage of any length in which it does not occupy a marked prominence. Nor is his irony at all of the delicate or obscure kind. There is no mistaking it in such a passage as this,—we quote from the Essay entitled 'The Order of Poverty':—

'There was one order, Teutonic, if we mistake not, the Order of Fools. There was a quaint sincerity in the very title of it. The

philosophy was out-speaking; and, more than all, the constitution of such a chapter admitted knights against whose worthiness, whose peculiar right to wear the badge, no envious demagogue could say his bitter saying. . . . From the mere abstract love of justice, we should be right glad to have the Order of Fools revived in the fullest splendour of folly. Such an order would so beneficently provide for many unrewarded public idlers,—aye, and public workers also.’—p. 321.

Here is another specimen equally trenchant:—

‘You will hear a good lowly creature sing the praises of pure water—call it the wine of Adam when he walked in Paradise—when, somehow, fate has bestowed upon the eulogist the finest Burgundy. He declares himself contented with a crust, although a beneficent fairy has hung a fat haunch or two in his larder. . . . Yes, it is delightful to see these humble folks, who tune their tongues to the honour of dry bread and water, compelled by the force of fortune to chew venison and swallow claret.’—p. 36.

It is manifest, we think, from the volumes before us, that Mr. Jerrold has made great progress since the earliest of his works was published; it is certainly not too much to expect that he will yet attain to a much higher position than the one he now occupies. As it is, his writings are worthy of more attention than they receive from the large class to whom his qualities, both of mind and heart, are little known. We trust it has been shown that he is no mere wit; not simply a satirist of social follies, but a man of strong convictions and keen sensibilities, equally alive to what is grave and serious, to the ludicrous and the mirthful. His errors, and they arise as often from the strength of his feelings as from his repugnance to all that is formal and hollow, are not those of a man who lacks charity, but are frequently the result of a too ready acquiescence of the judgment in the dictates of a heart easily and strongly moved. He has contributed much that is healthful and invigorating to the literature of the day, and we think his faults may be lightly passed over in consideration of his sympathy with so much that is true and elevating.

ART. IV.—*Speeches, Parliamentary and Miscellaneous.* By the Right Hon. Thomas Babington Macaulay. In Two Volumes. 8vo. London: Henry Vizetelly. 1853.

2. *Speeches of the Right Hon. T. B. Macaulay, M.P.* Corrected by himself. 8vo. London: Longman and Co. 1854.

THE announcement of the publication of these volumes must have suggested to many minds some pleasant reminiscences. Many must recollect the feelings with which some twenty years or more ago, while scanning the solid columns of the parliamentary debates, their eye was relieved by a loose type, and rested on the words Mr. Macaulay 'then rose and spoke as follows.' They remember the flush of pleasure with which they addressed themselves to a closer perusal; their intolerance of interruption, and their selfish wish to be left alone while their minds were absorbed in those eloquent passages reported even with a comparative fidelity, which, considering the unexampled rapidity of the speaker, constituted a master-piece of this modern art. They remembered the delight with which they followed the orator, only modified by the *amari aliquid* of the impatience with which they awaited the grand climax of the peroration; and if not familiar with Hansard, they longed, no doubt, to peruse these wonderful efforts in the very words in which they were delivered.

In the former of the publications before us, we have, more or less complete, almost all the public addresses of Mr. Macaulay, either within or without the walls of parliament. In the latter, we have twenty-nine of his principal speeches, corrected by himself. It is to the publication of the former volumes by Mr. Vizetelly that we owe Mr. Macaulay's edition of his speeches, and that under circumstances which call for a fair and impartial consideration. In his preface, he says—

'It was most reluctantly that I determined to suspend during the last autumn, a work which is the business and pleasure of my life, in order to prepare these speeches for publication; and it is most reluctantly that I now give them to the world. Even if I estimated their oratorical merit much more highly than I do, I should not willingly have revived in the quiet times in which we are so happy as to live, the memory of those fierce contentions in which too many years of my life were passed. Many expressions which, when society was convulsed by political dissension, and when the foundations of government were shaking, were heard by an excited audience with sympathy and applause, may, now that the passions of all parties have subsided, be thought intemperate and acrimonious.'

After specially instancing his conflicts with Sir Robert Peel, and passing a generous eulogy on that lamented statesman, he thus proceeds to account for the publication of his speeches by himself:—

‘Unhappily an act, for which the law affords no redress, but which I have no hesitation in pronouncing to be a gross injury to me and a gross fraud on the public, has compelled me to do what I should never have done willingly. A bookseller, named Vizetelly, who seems to aspire to that sort of distinction which Curll enjoyed a hundred and twenty years ago, thought fit, without asking my consent, without even giving me any notice, to announce an edition of my speeches, and was not ashamed to tell the world in his advertisement that he published them by special licence. When the book appeared, I found it contained fifty-six speeches, said to have been delivered by me in the House of Commons. Of these speeches a few were reprinted from reports which I had corrected for the ‘Mirror of Parliament,’ or the ‘Parliamentary Debates,’ and were, therefore, with the exception of some errors of the pen and the press, correctly given. The rest bear scarcely the faintest resemblance to the speeches which I really made. The substance of what I said is perpetually misrepresented; the connexion of the arguments is altogether lost; extravagant blunders are put into my mouth in almost every page. An editor, who had the smallest regard for truth, or for the fame of the person whose speeches he had undertaken to publish, would have had recourse to the various sources of information, which were readily accessible; and by collating them, would have produced a book which would at least have contained no absolute nonsense. But I have, unfortunately, had an editor whose only object was to make a few pounds, and who was willing to sacrifice to that object my reputation and his own. He took the very worst report extant, compared it with no other report, removed no blemish, however obvious or however ludicrous, gave to the world some hundreds of pages utterly contemptible both in matter and manner, and prefixed my name to them.’—Preface, pp. 8, 9.

These are unquestionably heavy charges; Mr. Macaulay has a *prima facie* case, and so practised a controversialist might well be trusted to make the most of it. Few men are more jealous of their literary reputation than our great modern essayist, critic, and historian. An enthusiastic connoisseur of pictures or china would care far less for the loss of the money which represents the market value of the article than for a scratch across the eye of a portrait by Vandyke, or a crack across the surface of a precious vase. In the one case, the pecuniary loss might be replaced; in the other, the damage is irreparable. It is just so with the elaborate style of Mr. Macaulay. It is the mosaic of literature; the displacement of an atom is fatal, and the issue to the world of a blemished sentence, or a dislocated paragraph, to be reproduced by a thousand presses, and circulated over continents, would occasion to such a mind as Mr. Macaulay's the pungent

mortification of a lasting, irrefutable libel. For this feeling much allowance must be made. One so keen to discern the literary defects of others must naturally be supposed to look with a sensitive jealousy on his own productions. He has well earned a right to the plenitude of his fame.

Still justice must be done to the publisher who has ventured to supply Mr. Macaulay's lack of public service by giving his speeches to the world. In one respect we think Mr. Vizetelly has erred. Such speeches as these, teeming in every paragraph with historical, classical, and even more recondite illustrations and allusions, unquestionably required a careful and even a learned editorship. This the publisher does not pretend to have secured. He simply says in his advertisement, 'The Parliamentary speeches forming the first portion of the present work have been reprinted by special license from the revised reports published in Hansard's *'Parliamentary Debates.'* The miscellaneous speeches have been derived from a variety of sources; but in every instance great care has been taken to select the best report that could be met with.'

It may be said that Mr. Macaulay himself is the only man who was fully competent to prepare his speeches for the press. This we think must be granted; but it is equally certain that he could not have been induced to undertake this office. The next alternative was to obtain the services of an editor of the highest degree of literary ability. This assuredly has not been done; and in this respect, and in this only, the publisher appears to have laid himself fairly open to Mr. Macaulay's censure.

Under the sanction of the right honourable gentleman's exposition of the principles and the law of copyright, as expressed in his speech on Mr. Sergeant Talfourd's bill, Mr. Vizetelly announced Mr. Macaulay's speeches for publication. After doing so he wrote a request to the Marquis of Lansdowne, that his lordship would permit the dedication of the work to him. The reply of the marquis indicated no sense of the impropriety of the publisher's project, but expressed a willing consent contingent upon Mr. Macaulay's approbation. Upon this Mr. Vizetelly wrote to Mr. Macaulay informing him of what he had done, and what he proposed. The right honourable gentleman's reply was simply an abstract of that preface to his own edition to which we are about more particularly to allude.

The publication of Mr. Vizetelly's volumes in July, 1853, led, as we have seen, to the production of Mr. Macaulay's work in December of the same year. The preface to Mr. Macaulay's edition contains three specific charges and one explanatory declaration, all of which it is our duty to notice. The charges are first that of the grossest inaccuracy. He goes so far as to say—

‘As to faults of syntax and of style, hardly one sentence in a hundred is free from them.’ The second is a charge of ‘gross injury to himself and a gross fraud upon the public.’ The third is stated in the following words—‘I have unfortunately had an editor whose only object was to make a few pounds, and who was willing to sacrifice to that object my reputation, and his own.’ The explanatory declaration referred to is in the following terms:—

‘The substance of the remaining speeches’ (after specifying nine which he had corrected verbatim for Hansard), ‘I have given with perfect ingenuousness. I have not made alterations for the purpose of saving my own reputation either for consistency or for foresight. I have not softened down the strong terms in which I formerly expressed opinions which time and thought may have modified; nor have I retouched my predictions in order to make them correspond with subsequent events. Had I represented myself as speaking in 1831, in 1840, or in 1845, as I should speak in 1853, I should have deprived my book of its chief value. This volume is now at least a strictly honest record of opinions and reasonings which were heard with favour by a large part of the Commons of England at some important conjunctures; and such a record, however low it may stand in the estimation of the literary critic, cannot but be of use to the historian.’

Now if there is to be a system of literary police, ever so gentle and controlled, it is the duty of every reader to give a fair hearing to a defence against these serious accusations. We will take them in their order; and as to the first, with all our grief at seeing the exquisite style of Mr. Macaulay marred in its slightest feature, we must say that the sweeping charge of inaccurate syntax and faulty style in ninety-nine out of every hundred sentences is an exaggeration so outrageous as is only to be explained by extreme irritation of feeling. For that jealous irritability we have already endeavoured to account; that it has led him into an utter misstatement we fearlessly assert. The mistakes which Mr. Macaulay instances undoubtedly exist, and some of them are sufficiently ridiculous; but the reader may peruse page after page of those speeches which appear only in Mr. Vizetelly’s volumes without missing the well known graces of the speaker’s rhetoric. However far short they may fall of Mr. Macaulay’s fastidious ideal, we must regard them (and he at least must forgive our enthusiasm) as an invaluable boon to that million save one of the Anglo-Saxon race who would no more think of purchasing Hansard’s ‘Parliamentary Debates’ than they would of possessing—we might even say of reading—the statutes at large.

The two remaining charges require a closer investigation. In the former of these Mr. Macaulay accuses the publisher of a ‘gross injury to himself, and a gross fraud upon the public.’

The reference of this language will be understood by the terms of a letter now lying before us, addressed by Mr. Macaulay to Mr. Vizetelly, dated July 6th, 1853. Mr. Macaulay says, 'Before I received your letter I had seen the advertisement in which you thought fit to announce that you were about to publish my speeches by "*special license*."' It is impossible to doubt in what sense you meant those words to be understood, and I must plainly say that in using them you have been guilty of gross injustice to me and a fraud upon the public.' The gravity of this charge renders it necessary that in justice to Mr. Vizetelly the whole truth should be told.

We have before us a copy of the reply of Mr. Vizetelly, addressed to Mr. Macaulay the same day (July 6th), in which we find the following passage:—'I think it necessary to disabuse your mind as to the intention sought to be conveyed by the words "*by special license*" contained in the announcement of the edition of your speeches. It only found its way into the announcement at all simply because when I purchased of Mr. Hansard the license to use the reports from the '*Parliamentary Debates*,' he required that the exact wording should be printed in some conspicuous place in the volumes themselves and in all the advertisements. If you doubt the statement, Mr. Hansard can be appealed to. He must substantiate it, for it was his positive requirement, and no suggestion of my own. It never even occurred to me that the phrase would be construed in any other than its *bona fide* sense, or it should not have stood as it does; but to remove all chance of possible misapprehension, it shall be so altered for the future that no doubt can exist on the subject.' This explanation appears to us entirely satisfactory, and we believe that within a week of this date, advertisements were issued altering the ambiguous phrase to '*published by special license of the proprietors*,' an expression which assuredly made it quite clear that the license was not granted by Mr. Macaulay, even if the granting of that license had been legally at his option, which it was not. The public reproduction, therefore, of the same charge by Mr. Macaulay five months afterwards appears to us an injustice to Mr. Vizetelly which cannot be vindicated.

Mr. Macaulay's third accusation is as follows:—'I, unfortunately, had an editor, whose only object was to make a few pounds, and who was willing to sacrifice to that object my reputation and his own.' Here again we fear Mr. Macaulay has been led into an injustice which we find it difficult to reconcile with our high appreciation of his character. For, in Mr. Vizetelly's first letter to him, that gentleman says:—'I do not desire to profit unfairly by a matter which I have entered upon more from my admiration of the

speeches themselves and the feeling that their publication would to some extent advance the cause of good government than as a mere matter of business, and I shall feel obliged if you will name any person to whom, on your behalf, I can account from time to time for the profits arising from the sale of the work.' Mr. Vizetelly thus virtually places the profits of the work at Mr. Macaulay's disposal. Is it fair and honourable after this to charge him with a selfish and sordid greed of gain?

Mr. Macaulay's final explanation repudiates any desire to preserve a semblance of consistency during a political career which has continued through the changeful scenes of the last five-and-twenty years. We are by no means disposed to except against this profession; but the speeches he has published in the volume before us bear but a small proportion to the number of those comprised in the two volumes given to the public by Mr. Vizetelly; and we cannot help remarking, as a significant fact, that some of the ablest of the suppressed speeches contain heavy charges against some of the most distinguished members of the present administration.

And now we gladly leave our judicial task and address ourselves, though necessarily with great brevity, to the speeches themselves. They are truly historical documents. They lead us through the greatest questions which have agitated the public mind for a period during which the young have grown old, and the old (alas! how many) have passed away. They stand as a faithful record of that grand advance of popular opinion and political wisdom which the present generation has been privileged to witness, and in which the large and improving majority of the people have been destined to take a part. Unlike abstract philosophers whose sagacity is, as it were, the telescope of futurity, Mr. Macaulay is one of those men whose elaborate education and whose enlightened principles are the creature of the age. Highly fitted for all the purposes of public life, he has devoted himself to the service of his generation. To that service he has brought a profound acquaintance with ancient and modern literature, with constitutional law, and with the requirements of those strange and unexampled times in which his lot has been cast, which qualify him for the functions he has sustained, whether as a critic, an historian, or a statesman. Like the majority of men of genius, his faculties were developed at an early age. His first production, which took society by surprise—the critical essay on Milton, in the 'Edinburgh Review'—was written, if we recollect rightly, while he was an under-graduate at the University of Cambridge, and his first parliamentary address was delivered as early as the spring of 1830.

To eulogize, or even to characterize, the productions of Mr.

Macaulay, whether spoken or written, would now be a trite occupation. We rather take this opportunity of opposing some of the opinions he has enunciated, and in doing so, however widely we may differ from him, we shall not violate those sentiments of admiration with which we regard his genius and his character. The productions before us are, of necessity, controversial, and as a controversialist Mr. Macaulay appears to us to fall habitually into an error, attributable, in part, perhaps, to his professional training as a lawyer, and in part to that facility of illustration which is supplied by extensive learning and a boundless memory. The mischievous result we mean to indicate is the overstatement of his case, and the special pleading and exaggeration of his advocacy. These faults, if we are correct in our criticism, concealed beneath the efflorescent verdure of his rhetoric, produce a fallacious effect on the mind of the reader, which can be dissipated only by a stern and stoical examination.

We will take one or two prominent examples. His speech in the House of Commons on the 19th of April, 1847, on the proposed grant of one hundred thousand pounds for the education of the people, is remarkable for the strictly logical form in which he marshals his arguments against Mr. Duncombe's amendment. He thus accounts for Lord George Gordon's riots :—

‘The cause was the ignorance of a population which had been suffered in the neighbourhood of palaces, theatres, temples, to grow up as rude and stupid as any tribe of tattooed cannibals in New Zealand, I might say, as any drove of beasts in Smithfield Market. The instance is striking, but it is not solitary. To the same cause are to be ascribed the riots of Nottingham, the sack of Bristol, all the outrages of Ludd, and Swing, and Rebecca ; beautiful and costly machinery broken to pieces in Yorkshire, barns and haystacks blazing in Kent, fences and buildings pulled down in Wales. Could such things have been done in a country in which the mind of the labourer had been opened by education, in which he had been taught to find pleasure in the exercise of his intellect, taught to revere his Maker, taught to respect legitimate authority, and taught, at the same time, to seek the redress of real wrongs by peaceful and constitutional means ?’

We pass by the comparison of our humble fellow-countrymen to tattooed savages and beasts at Smithfield, and we warmly concur with Mr. Macaulay in his condemnation of outrage and riot, but we submit that he conceals an essential part of the case. Surely something must be allowed for unjust legislation, for ‘unequal’ taxation, for fiscal laws which the poorest and less educated are quite able to comprehend, which create artificial famine, which come home to every man's business and stomach, and which Mr. Macaulay has been the foremost to oppose. We know,

on indisputable authority, that 'oppression will make a wise man mad.' It is unfortunate that we cannot produce the same authority as to the effect it is likely to have on the inhabitants of Monmouthshire, Nottingham, and Bristol. Again, Mr. Macaulay attributes these outrages to the want of education as to the duties of the people to God, to their rulers as such, and to the constitution under which they live. But where is the evidence that they do not know these duties? The facts only prove that they do not perform them:—whether from a difference of opinion as to their obligation, or from a conviction that their political wrongs override all such considerations, or, again, from a wilful disobedience to recognised duty, does not appear on the record. How this is to be remedied by Mr. Macaulay's scheme of education we confess ourselves unable to understand. The absence of 'maps on the wall,' and the 'broken slates' have, we think, but little to do with it.

This is one of the instances of Mr. Macaulay's overcharging of his case; but the argument he founds upon it deserves a closer examination. 'This, then,' he says, 'is my argument. It is the duty of government to protect our persons and property from danger. The gross ignorance of the common people is a principal cause of danger to our persons and property. Therefore it is the duty of the government to take care that the common people shall not be grossly ignorant.' A syllogism is a dangerous weapon. If faulty in either of its members, it resembles the boomerang which, the more violently it is projected, recoils with the greater force over the head of the projector, and strikes the game behind him. The major and the minor of Mr. Macaulay's syllogism may be fairly admitted, but the consequent is all adrift on a variety of vague conditions. We grant that the function of government is to protect life and property. We grant that popular ignorance is an obstacle to this necessary purpose, but how does it follow that government must of necessity overcome that obstacle? The consequent is simply that the obstacle must be overcome; but if there are other and better means of overcoming it than any which the government can supply, and especially if there are solid reasons why government should not supply them, the syllogism collapses. Now this is precisely our argument. There are two powers which can be brought to bear against popular ignorance and immorality. The one is the force of law, the other is the permeating influence of private intelligence, philanthropy, and zeal. Mr. Macaulay's argument is not new to us. We owe it, if our recollection serves us, to Dean Milner, and we well recollect that it was repeated by the late Professor Scholefield.

It runs thus:—Religion is not like the ordinary wants of a people, in which the supply will be regulated by the demand.

Unlike the case of corn and sugar and the other necessities of life, the demand will be the less in proportion to the deficiency of the supply. Therefore, says the High Churchman, the state must supply the deficiency. The false logic lies in the consequent, which should be, therefore, religion must be aggressive, but whether the aggression should be made by the state, or by private and popular effort, is a question with which the syllogism has nothing to do. Mr. Macaulay pours contempt on the inefficiency of the voluntary principle in education by a retrospect of the last three or four generations. He asks, in effect, what voluntary education has done. This appeal was made some years ago, and surely we may again apply his own argument to the Established Church, which, after all, has been the great obstacle. We might say that up to the time when Whitefield and Wesley established a *quasi* voluntaryism in the Established Church, the major part of England was sunk in that depth of ignorance and immorality which created home missions and similar arrangements. The efforts of the state were futile and hopeless, and the religious teachers of the Established Church throughout the rural districts were what Mr. Conybeare humorously describes them, in his late article in the 'Edinburgh Review,' 'either Nimrods, fishing-rods, or ram-rods.'

The case of religion and of education seemed thus far, as the lawyers say, to run on all fours; but we revert from these historical facts to Mr. Macaulay's syllogism. We will propound another. It is the duty of every wise and good man to oppose the promulgation of error. The system of religious teaching by the state is admitted on all hands to allow of the propagation of error of the most essential kind. Therefore it is the duty of every wise and good man to oppose the establishment of religion by the state. Mr. Macaulay thinks that children of every denomination should be made to know, through the patronage of the state, that the Cape of Good Hope is not in Canada. But of what use is this information, if they are to be taught the doctrine of sacramental efficacy through the services of baptism and confirmation, and of transubstantiation in the catechism? If Mr. Macaulay excepts against this reasoning, we must revert to his own method of syllogism. If it is the duty of government to provide education for the people, it is *à fortiori* their duty to provide education on the most important of all subjects. Religion is the most important of all subjects; therefore it is the duty of the state to provide religious instruction for the people. The admission is, practically, fatal; for we have popery in one diocese, religious Orangeism in another, mild evangelicism in a third, and anything-ism in a fourth; while the leaders of each of these parties appeal confidently, and as we believe, successfully, to the

Prayer-book, to which they have sworn in common as the pillar and ground of their faith, for the truth of their motley and irreconcilable dogmas. If, therefore, Mr. Macaulay's theory of state education is to embrace religious teaching, it seems logically to involve an error, which he himself, on mature consideration, would, we think, be found to admit.

But the right honourable gentleman screens himself under what appears to us to be a transparent fallacy. He urges that, even if error is taught, much truth is taught with it, and that the one should be accepted for the sake of the other. We differ from him entirely. There is the same distinction between ignorance of religious truth, and the reception of religious error, which exists between an indolent and a malignant tumour in the body. Of mere religious ignorance, it may be said, comparatively, that it does not produce moral mischief; while religious error is a moral poison. The religious quietism of the savage is not so bad as the pious assassination of the Hindoo.

We cannot help thinking, that Mr. Macaulay's views on this subject are singularly crude. He sums them up in these words:— 'Will any Protestant deny that it is better that the Irish should be Roman Catholics than they should live and die like the beasts of the field?' But here we must venture to arrest him with the questions, 'Is there no alternative? Are the Irish missions mere nullities, and were they suitably stimulated and encouraged through the absence of a repressive legislation, might they not, by gentleness, candour, and the force of truth, produce those results which missionary efforts have produced, and are extensively producing, on the most uncivilized of mankind? Are the Irish a lower species than the New Zealanders? If the force of a pure religion can tell upon cannibalism and the suttee, we do not despair of its success in Connaught and Munster.

But he adds, 'I wish Christianity to have a great influence on the peasantry of Ireland. I see no probability that Christianity will have that influence, except in one form. That form I consider as very corrupt. Nevertheless, the good seems to me greatly to predominate over the evil; and, therefore, being unable to get the good alone, I am content to take the good and evil together.'

Now, it appears to us that the same argument would apply to Mahomedanism. That recognises the unity and righteous government of God, and the responsibility and immortality of man; and the Koran is not wanting in those moral precepts which, like the leaves of the tree of life, even where the fruit is absent, are still for the healing of the nations. But the question is, as Mr. Macaulay's logical mind will perceive on a moment's reflection, whether the errors of catholicism are not radically and

essentially injurious? Whether the doctrines of sacramental efficacy, of works of supererogation, of indulgence, and absolution are not vitally hostile to the Christian religion? And whether the celibacy of the clergy, the practice of auricular confession, and the powers and social influence of the priesthood, are not inimical to public morality? Let those who hold these tenets, and who observe these practices, hold and practise them by a right independent even of toleration itself; but surely those who regard both the principles and the practice as destructive of the souls of men should not be bound by law to promote either the one or the other.

Mr. Macaulay, in his distrust of the voluntary principle, is imperfect in his information, and, in his spirit, behind the times. 'The person,' he says, 'about whom I am uneasy is the working man; the man who would find it difficult to pay even five shillings or ten shillings a-year out of his small earnings for the ministrations of religion. What is to become of him under the voluntary system? Is he to go without religious instruction altogether? That we should all think a great evil to himself, and a great evil to society.' We confess that we are surprised to hear such language from a man so deeply acquainted with the social and religious history of this country. We would recall his attention to a period within the recollection of many who read these pages, when the great body of the provincial clergy of England were utterly perfunctory and stagnant. What but the voluntary principle troubled these waters? What but that principle covered the land with Sunday and British and Foreign schools? What originated Home Missions throughout the rural districts of England? What organized the Bible and the Tract Societies? What sent the men, of whom the world was not worthy, with their lives in their hands, from Greenland to the Cape, and from China to Sierra Leone, to establish the *nuclei* of a pure religion and a progressive civilization? What has translated the Scriptures into unnumbered dialects? What has made the negro slave a Christian who can even afford to dispense with the services of a bishop? What but that very voluntary principle whose efficacy Mr. Macaulay distrusts?

Did our space allow it, we should pursue a similar investigation into Mr. Macaulay's views of parliamentary reform; and in doing so we think we might successfully expose the two defects we have already indicated, namely, the overcharging of his case as an orator, and an unjustifiable distrust of the people. His approbation of the ballot is indeed an apparent exception; but it is hard to see how this can consist with a deep distrust either of the political sagacity, or of the right mindedness of the great body of the people. The ballot appears to us to involve in all fairness

a very wide representation. The unrepresented naturally feel their condition as a hardship; but if, in addition to this, they are to be ignorant of the course taken by those who, under a false theory, are regarded as their representatives at the poll, they sink to the level of mere serfs of the soil.

Of the oratory of Mr. Macaulay it is difficult to speak in too high terms, while a discriminating criticism, if it assumes the form of comparison, must necessarily awaken in the mind of the reader a consciousness of various and even striking points of difference. Still, if we were to institute such a comparison, we should mention, without hesitation, the name of Mr. Burke. Mr. Macaulay's conscious and independent power has, doubtless, withheld him from adopting any, even the greatest of orators, as his model; but we are greatly mistaken if he has not studied the writings of Mr. Burke in an attitude of unconscious imitation. We find in the volumes before us passages which, to one who is acquainted with the gait of Burke's oratory, will not fail to suggest recollections of that wonderful man. Take, for example, a passage in his speech on the government of India, and we think it might be mistaken for Burke:—

'The effect of that admission would be to raise a hundred questions, to produce a hundred contests between the council and the judicature. The government would be paralyzed at the precise moment at which all its energy would be required. While the two equal powers were acting in opposite directions, the whole machine of the state would stand still. The Europeans would be uncontrolled; the natives would be unprotected. The consequences I will not pretend to foresee. Everything beyond is darkness and confusion.'

The peroration of the same speech may not only be adduced as a similar instance, but also deserves to be cited as a specimen of Macaulay's condensed and yet impressive eloquence:—

'The destinies of our Indian empire are covered with thick darkness. It is difficult to form any conjecture as to the fate reserved for a state which resembles no other in history, and which forms by itself a separate class of political phenomena. The laws which regulate its growth and its decay are still unknown to us. It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that having become instructed in European knowledge, they may, in some future age, demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or to retard it. Whenever it comes it will be the proudest day in English history. To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to make them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens, would indeed be a title to glory all our own. The sceptre

may pass away from us. Unforeseen accidents may derange our most profound schemes of policy. Victory may be inconstant to our arms. But there are triumphs which are followed by no reverse. There is an empire exempt from all natural causes of decay. Those triumphs are the pacific triumphs of reason over barbarism; that empire is the imperishable empire of our arts and our morals, our literature and our laws.'—p. 163.

Mr. Macaulay's style appears to us to reach as nearly as possible the ideal of perfection. As his thoughts solidify into language, they seem to crystallize; and his sentences, sharp and defined with geometrical accuracy, are iridescent with all the hues that can charm the taste. His style has all the distinctness and all the weight of Bentham and Johnson without the tortuosity of the one or the Latinization of the other. While it avoids the blunt Saxon of Cobbett and the unnaturalized German of Carlyle, it equally avoids the opposite fault of tame and effeminate insipidity. It imports, without pedantry, all the riches and delicacies derived from ancient and modern literature into an essentially English composition. He uses our language as a master's hand plays upon an organ;—sounding its depths, reaching its utmost varieties, and exhibiting it to the world as that great medium of discourse which deserves, as it bids fair, to be the adopted language of the civilized world.

Let but Mr. Macaulay in his political career, place an unwavering faith in truth, and a generous confidence in his countrymen, and he will add to the greatest of literary reputations that wreath of popular homage, which the greatest men of all ages have made it their highest object to solicit, and which will crown his memory with an imperishable fame.

ART. V.—*Historical Parallels*. By A. Malkin, A.M. New Edition. Three Volumes. Cox and Co. 1853.

THERE is a singular interest in the study of Italian history. In it we observe more clearly, perhaps, than in any other, the action of those laws through the operation of which communities rise, reach the acmè of their prosperity, and fall into decay. We perceive how the accidents of nature affect the character and the designs of man; how the same country may, at different times, become the opprobrium and the glory of civilization, the pride and the shame of the world. We learn how a nation, with a mighty genius, may make its liberty complete, and the works of its art sublime, and then, feeling the enervation of satiety,

exchange its freedom for oppression, its native laws for foreign rule, its industry for indolence, its ancient happiness and splendour for servitude, misery, and ruin, which leave for the future an inheritance of unavailing sorrow.

The characteristics of Italian history, philosophically drawn, would form a simple explanation of that history itself. The most conspicuous of them appears to be an invariable disposition in the people to seek for friends in their councils, leaders in their armies, models for their art, and even kings for their thrones, beyond their own frontier. They are oppressed by alien tyrannies;—their very patriotism looks for an ally. Again, since the Gothic invasion, they have been remarkable less for intellect than for imagination. They have suffered emulation to rankle into jealousy in the rivalry of their numerous states. They have allowed families to betray them through their gratitude. They have, in their assiduous culture of the refining graces of society, forgotten the colder and sterner science, which not only secures the possession but teaches the value of political liberty. These ideas are justified when we reflect on the romantic but mournful history to which they refer.

Even in antiquity, the possessors of that celebrated peninsula refused to trust their own power, but looked back for an archetype to the soil whence their richest settlers sprung. The feeling was common, not only to Thurian and Sybarite, but to the posterity of the Alban race—the forgotten founders of Rome. The genius of Italy derived its vitality from the genius of Greece. First, on its lower shores, Grecian art was introduced by colonists who were addicted less to sculpture in marbles and metals, than to architecture and the moulding and pencilling of those festal or funereal urns which remain the types of grace and taste to all the world. The relics of this age, so prolific of beauty, are found chiefly in Campania, Lucania, and Apulia. Then there was a chain of nations, extending through the interior, who, by their own activity, naturalized the art which had been transplanted among them. It was they who left, for the delight of all time, those Etruscan marvels—terra-cotta relievos and vases—which give to Etruria its renown, and derive from it their name. But the architectural and plastic trophies of Italy are chiefly owing to the bold and powerful genius with which the Romans appropriated the art of Greece, and made it subordinate to their own. Themselves the least creative of nations, they took from the most creative their example and their inspiration. What they imitated from others seemed new when freshly-moulded in their hands; for while they copied to perfection, they impressed a peculiar character on all, and thus a Latin order was added to the ancient types of Assyria, Egypt, and Attica. Thus was pro-

duced that wealth of temples, palaces, statues, and urns, which made Italy the museum of the world and Rome the museum of Italy. A commercial and a conquering people, they expended on a refined magnificence the treasures acquired by their arms and their industry.

Long, indeed, after the Romans had ceased to embellish their city with columns, porticoes, and propylea, with arches, fountains, and statues, they continued to collect the antique relics of art wherever they remained amid the desolation of Europe. This process ceased with the oblivion of letters, but was renewed on their revival, when the name of 'Roman' had passed out of use, and only that of 'Italian' was familiar. The ruins of literature and art were gathered from all parts of the world, and stored up in Italy to be defended from the violence which everywhere else threatened them. The hand of the sculptor, the architect, and the painter was unknown among the other nations. We are referred, indeed, in contradiction of this, to the gorgeous palaces and mausolea of the Moguls in India, and to the mosques and halls of the Moors in Spain. We are reminded that Agra was then embellished by the marble glories of the Taj-Mahal, and that Seville was adorned by the painted roofs and fretted arches of the Alcazar and the Golden Tower. But the sepulchres of the East, notwithstanding their rich Moresco style, were built by Italian artists, and the triumphal monuments of the Mohammedan dynasty in Andalusia are traced to Italian designs, even when the architects themselves were not of that nation. Nothing of the contrary is to be inferred from the characteristics of those structures, for men were born in Italy to give permanence to the beautiful in every shape. In one city the deep warm oriel, the heavy groin, the fresco, and the imposing Rembrandt shade, represent the genius of the Gothic race; and near it, with aerial symmetry, arises the milk-white marble cathedral of Milan, every capital and shaft appearing to hang like a vision in the air. The tombs of the Scaligers—spiry, fretted, rich with decoration, were created by hands which threw arches, delicate as snow, and light as the rainbow, from pillar to pillar of more than Ionian grace.

Why Italy became imperial in the arts cannot be explained without confessing a superior genius in the people. It appears as false to suppose that great painters were created solely because they were called for, as to imagine that the Athenians derived their excellence in sculpture from the facilities for studying the human form, afforded by the runners and wrestlers at the Olympic games. The works of Titian are more applauded now than when Titian lived, just as Milton's poetry and Cervantes' romance were freely acknowledged long after the poet and the novelist were in the tomb. There are women in the south, too,

as beautiful as any that Raffaele painted; but is it because national taste has gone, that no art can now rival the 'Marriage of the Virgin?' There are the types of Apollo in Greece; but there is no Phidias. There are tears on weepers' cheeks, but no more mournful Niobe. There are daily the blushes of the dawn, but no new Guido's Aurora;—peaches in Cos, but no Apelles. It was the genius of the people, their aspiring character, their lofty and luminous imagination, their knowledge of the beautiful, and their ambition to be great, that made them at once superb in their works, and free in the enjoyment of them. A republican spirit, which is synonymous with virtue, elevated them not more above the poor bordering mountaineers, than above the perfumed slaves of Persia, with a wider dominion, and more abundant riches than their own.

Unhappily, they were too prosperous. They turned giddy at the heights from which they looked down on an inferior world. Their commerce was spread over every known ocean; their art embellished every city, every shrine, and every sacred grove, from the Tyrrhene to the Adriatic Sea. They fostered the allurements of peace long after they had ceased to triumph in the fame of war, and increasing in luxury as they increased in wealth they sank at length into so voluptuous a languor, that the republic which Corinth could not rival nor Carthage subdue, was degraded into an empire, and left as the divided inheritance of conflicting factions. Next in the mournful procession of its fate—*tristis et luctuosa successio*—it was overrun, now by the hordes of Parthia, and now by a swarm of savages, rushing like wolves, from the morasses and the woods of Germany.

The Italians had been pre-eminent in valour in days when Troy was not a myth. They were pre-eminent in art in days when the marbles of Ephesus were still trodden by the worshippers of Diana. They became pre-eminent in luxury in days when the spices of the East first gave their perfume to the festivals of Rome, and the fleeces of Thessaly were dyed in the purple of Tyre. An Asiatic effeminacy stole over the Roman mind. Syrian slaves were imported to grace with their beauty, and sometimes to stain with their blood, the table, the couch, and the divan. The people, as well as their rulers, were gradually tainted with every moral and political vice, and the corruption of manners was followed by the corruption of the laws. Christianity for awhile stayed the progress of decay, but was itself obscured by an influence which it could not overpower. Men were too vile and blind to know the truth when they saw it, or to love it when they knew it. The empire trembled. Turk, Parthian, and Persian advanced from the East; Hun and Vandal from the West, and Italy was buried out of the view of the world. Long it was

indeed before the whole colossus fell, but in the tenth century the Saracen standard, which had for ages been brightening under the rising sun, suddenly flashed across the Adriatic. The Normans led in the French, who were cursed as the most savage of races until the Spaniards came, whose lizard-like tyranny was only less base than that of the Germans. They were slaves arguing their fellows into slavery. Their zeal was that of the whip-taught cur; their vigilance that of the convict escort of a criminal. And when to this *iliad* of humiliation it was added that Italians were carried off from their own shores, by Mohammedan pirates, and sold like the negroes of Africa, the miseries of Italy were complete, and she endured a shame, which even Lepanto did not entirely redeem.

Still she preserved traces of the ancient civilization. Knowledge and refinement were never entirely quenched. Cities were built, became populous, began commerce, and preserved Italy from utter decay; but amid them rose the popedom, the monarchy of priests, less brutal and more intellectual than the monarchy of kings, but worse, because its chains are less visible, and leave their rust not on the limbs, but on the mind. Around this grew up the republics which spread such a splendour over the whole region. All the modern monuments of Italy date from them. The paved highways, which lead even to the little villages on the tops of hills, were constructed by them in emulation of the Roman roads. The palaces adorning the smallest towns are relics of their liberal magnificence. Where republican institutions existed longest, as in Lucca, there the prosperity of the people was the last to decay, though that state while free became too rich to be secure, when all the rest of Italy was enslaved. Poverty is the best defence of the weak. India, Peru, the Moluccas are examples of the truth, for their opulence attracted conquerors, while immense barren tracts of the earth remain independent, protected by their aridity. Thus Lucca fell, while San Marino, happy in indigence, continued to preserve its liberty, like a spark after a fire, too insignificant to be extinguished. All the republics, however, failed one by one, from causes which we may briefly consider.

Nothing but a genius like that of the Romans could hold together in a compact cohering mass the varied elements of Italian nationality. These, by the infusion of new races, had become also far more discordant than they were in former times. Geographically, too, Italy seems designed for political division. It consists of a succession of countries, with distinct frontiers, and most accessible to each other by sea. Ancient Etruria was distributed into as many states as the mediæval Tuscany. Its plains lie amid circles of hills, like those which enclose the ter-

ritories of Lucca and Pisa; while many cities, like Sienna, Arrezzi, and Perugia, look from immense castellated eminences over the circuit of country under their rule. Even the populations are physically distinct. The Florentines, ill-formed and of low stature, seem separated by nature from the tall athletic Lucanese and the inhabitants of Pistoia, distinguished by the high forehead and the Roman nose.

Accordingly, since the light of poetry and learning, after its long eclipse, began to dawn over the memorials of antiquity, there have been many rival states on the peninsula. They have been sometimes in league, often at war, never long united, always mutually jealous, and seldom free from the domination of a foreign power. For, as each was not strong enough to defend itself against the others, it usually sued for aid from a stranger—an aid which its wealth enabled it easily to purchase. No courts in Europe were too proud to receive, with secret or avowed delight, an ambassador from the States of Florence, or Venice, or Milan. The poor countries were strong, and the rich one was weak, so that Italy became a mark for conquest, and was assailed at once by the arms of the Ottoman Sultan and the intrigues of the Most Christian King. In gold and silver, in cloths and silks, in opulent cities and fertile provinces, she overflowed with exuberant resources, but in patriotism she was poor; and when half Europe was her enemy, she failed to be the friend of herself. It was not the sword of Louis the Moor that reduced her to shame, but the policy of that proficient intriguer, Lorenzo the Florentine. Ferrara the first, as Ravenna was the last, to surrender her liberties, wrote a preamble to the articles of Italian servitude, when Tasso was sent to humble her under the golden lilies of the French throne.

The vintage of the Italian plains had attracted the pagans of Germany. The opulence of the Italian cities now attracted the descendants of that sylvan chivalry, which differed only in its armorial symbols and its etiquette from the chivalry of the middle ages. Both were alike inhuman, uncivilized, insolent; and if the former was more uncouth, the latter was more hypocritical. Both were unsoftened by the spirit, but stilted on the pedantry of virtue. Both, too, chartered themselves to the plunder of the earth, and wherever their cupidity turned, there were no Alps, Apennines, or Pyrenees. Italy was piled with riches. The West was barbarous, the East was indolent, but both poured their treasures in her lap. Her ports received and dismissed fleets laden with the spoils of all the known parts of the world. Africa sent its ivory and gold; India its drugs and gems; the Lebanon its cedars; Arabia its fragrant gums, with cinnamon from the farthest isles of Asia; the North its fleeces,

grain, and timber. The Crusaders threw tribute into the coffers of the Venetian and the Florentine. Their academies were more learned than the schools of Leyden, their exchanges more wealthy than the marts of Amsterdam. Arab and Persian students came as scholars to Padua, and the city of Livy's birth taught muezzins for the minarets of Mecca, and teachers of the Books of Zend. The Italians were triumphant in the fruits of their civilization. They penetrated every sea, settled on every coast, filled their banks with the gold of every commercial nation, bartered their manufactures in all the markets of Europe, and displayed in their finance a science not known before. Their hospitality was equal to their wealth; and it became a proverb, derived from a literal truth, that the Italians built their houses with wider doors, and more open to the streets, than those of any other country in Europe.

And then with all this prosperity arose the richer trophies of literature and art. The revival of learning renewed the songs of Italy in a language that might well console her for the loss of the ancient tongue. The stately and sonorous diction of Cicero, indeed, was among the echoes of the past; but Tully spoke in accents scarcely more classical than the new dialect of Tuscany. It was Dante who gave to the poetry of his beautiful land a voice of not less golden rhythm than was heard when the Attic and the Dorian contended for the crown of eloquence upon her shores. He vivified, as it were, a freshly-created form. His invocation to 'the silvery whiteness of that temperate star' may seem to be a call from its primal silence of that melody which, flowing like enchantment from his pen, raised him to no hopeless rivalry of the ancient muse. Yet, like Tasso, he suffered a long martyrdom in life, and only beheld his fame in the zenith when he took a parting glance at the earth from the approaches of the tomb. It is the pride of Italian history to relate how a poet was exalted at Florence, and how an orator was crowned at Rome. But from the theatre and the Capitol we look to the wilderness whither Dante was exiled, to the cell where Tasso was thrown among maniacs, to the dungeon where Pellico was immured, to the torture-chamber where Galileo suffered, and to the horrid spot where Ugolino and his sons were starved.

In the same train of poets were the graceful and passionate Petrarca; Boccaccio, with a style of Grecian sweetness; and Ariosto, whose modulations, though harmonized to the narrative of the wildest fable, please the ear like music. It became the pride of the Italian republics to foster art and learning. Orators, poets, historians, ennobled by their presence the halls of the merchant-princes of Venice, of Florence, of Ferrara, and Milan. Instead of burying themselves, like the barons of England, in

feudal castles entrenched among mountains, the Italian patricians built their palaces and villas in the midst of the population. The opulence they gained from the fat Lombard plains, from the silks of India, and the silver and gold of Africa and Spain, was worthily given to employ the pencil of Michael Angelo, to inspire the songs of Pulci, to encourage the wit of Politian, and the poetry of Tasso, which gave new delight to pavilion and garden, to terrace and wood, to bay, and lake, and valley. On the shores of the Adriatic what a forest of laurels was not reaped to honour the poets who sprung up around that famous sea! Dante, and Petrarca, and Ariosto were born and died upon its coast. And, across the peninsula, Virgil in Pausilipo seemed through a long posterity to have spoken with Tasso, who was nursed on the Bay of Naples, where the Sirens are fabled to have dwelt. Italy, therefore, was a festal region—the Circe of Europe, while on one side, Istria and Dalmatia lay, savage as a Tartar steppe, and on the other, France and England remained, barbarous and miserable, without dignity in their laws, without polish in their manners, without humanity in their social theories.

But, amid this blaze of poetry and painting, a false idea of public honour prevailed, and ethics were neglected. Three little books had restored the learning and purified the languages of Europe. There were not three to revive its polity. In all the concourse of illustrious Italian names only Macchiavelli was a profound and generous statesman, and only Massaniello was a patriot. Both of them failed, though the one left his works to posterity, while the other bequeathed nothing but a heroic example and the task of avenging his innocent blood. The great Florentine politician stands alone—with Fra Paolo, Guicciardini, and Vannini at a distance. The Medici and various families who resembled them, the Popes and their factions, were quite of another order; but through the first the liberties of Italy fell, and through the second a vicarious tyranny was established in many of the smaller states, as that of the Malatesta in Rimini, and that of the Manfredi in Faenza. The Visconti, whose baseness was emblemized by the vipers in their crest, seduced their country into servitude, and Sforza betrayed it by treachery of another kind. History agrees to reprobate their treason, but, with a traditional perverseness, continues to applaud the Medici as benefactors of Italy. They the benefactors of Italy! Florence alone, humiliated and enslaved, is a sufficing memorial of their crimes. But turn from her to the pestilent maremma of Sienna. That was a beautiful salubrious tract until Cosmo wasted it and transformed it into a deadly marsh. Fever-breeding swamps exist in the places where the republics cultivated fertile and healthy plains. The Roman territories, from Ferrara to the Pon-

tine Marshes, have become bare and putrid since the stagnation of industry ensuing on the decline of freedom. Cosmo dried up the fertilizing springs and streams of his country by hewing down the forests on the Tuscan Apennines. Rocky deserts now exist where the pastures in ancient times were rich with fleece, and a population of banditti derives its descent from shepherds and cultivators of the soil. If, therefore, they are benefactors who make men happy, the Medici and their kindred princes have nothing to claim from the gratitude of mankind. Whether they loved power for the sake of money, or money for the sake of power, they must be remembered for what they were,—the sordid and spendthrift patrons of spies.

It was the error, if not the crime, of the Italian people that while they lavished treasures on libraries, palaces, pictures, and statues; while they collected the rolls of Hebrew and Chaldaic literature, and the relics of Roman and Athenian art, they refused to spare sufficient to maintain the dignity and independence of their country. When they gave a helmet of silver for a canzone, they withheld, perhaps, the salary of an ambassador. Florence was an example. It came to be said, at last, that the Italians were the most parsimonious people in the world, the Tuscans the most parsimonious in Italy, the Florentines the most parsimonious in Tuscany. We may partly account for this by the absence from among them of an ethical and political literature from which the maxims of public honour and wisdom might be derived. Since the usurpation of Cæsar such a literature had not grown in Italy. It was drowned in the Rubicon. Gems and jewellery were the taste of the emperors, not politics or philosophy; and Lorenzo mimicked the imperial virtuosi, not only by his munificence to art, but by wearing on his finger a ring of Nero. The genius of the people was exhausted in poetry, frescoes, columns, cameos, marble reliefs, tables of jasper, signets, enamels, and pictures suffused with Titian's rich lights, with Tintoretto's warmth, or with the softer blush and serener beauty of Raffaele's maidens and Madonnas. Many as are the poets in their language, Campanella—unless Vico be added—is their only famous philosopher, and he gave his pen almost entirely to exploring the theories of Aristotle and disputing the politics of Macchiavelli. Casuists abounded, but their logic was as fruitless as that of the four-and-twenty fathers of Escobar. There were writers of elegant essays, too, but their speculations only glided over the surface and variety of nature. There was a prophecy, then, in Petrarca's line—*povera e nuda va filosofia*. Religion was corrupted by the tyranny of Rome. The Reformation, indeed, began in Italy, where liberty of opinion existed, with public lectures and discussions, but when its light struck the population

of the north, the south relapsed into popish darkness, and the clouds gathered again in an unbroken mass over the peninsula. Had the Christian doctrine, freely preached and pure, been fixed in the faith of the people, who can doubt that the liberty and the happiness of Italy would have prospered together? Without it, laws, however moral, are of no avail. The pandects of Justinian were sacred in the archives of Pisa, but Ugolino was starved there, nevertheless.

The Italians, even when they were statesmen, relied too much upon political subtleties and too little on the solid materials of power. But, more than all, their public spirit was vicious. They were too deeply absorbed in domestic emulation. They struggled to rival each other instead of uniting to make Italy the rival of the world. Thus their country became a prey to usurpers who enriched themselves, and inhabiting palaces which only Italians could build, adorned them with works of a beauty which only Italians could conceive. Any Spaniard might be King of Naples, but only a native of its soil could plan the villas and gardens along its bay. Any German might shake a sceptre over Venice, but only Venetians could rear so delightful a city and fill it with the music and beauty which gave it such a festal fame. All the consolation we enjoy, therefore, is in knowing the immortality of genius;—that, while Guelf and Ghibelline are blotted out of memory, the songs of the poets will continue to be sung among the 'blue lilies and purple vintage' of Tuscany; the painter's tints to flush with glory the walls of the Vatican; the sculptured shaft and plinth to shine like snow on Isola Bella, and the urns of an ancient race to adorn the villas of Etruria. The camp-fires of the French may burn on Mount Aventine, and fifty Austrian cannon be pointed at Saint Mark's, but neither 'flame nor sword, or Gaul or Goth,' can blot out the beauty of Dante's epic, or exile from our memories the lyrical eloquence of Tasso. Even those kindred barbarisms, indeed, have some pride in the art of the country they oppress, and some poetical respect for its traditions. They will cut men and women to pieces, but they protect the cypress of Sana, where Hannibal fought his first battle. They will hang fifty peasants in a day above the ashes of their household gods, but they suffer no axe to touch that oldest patriarch of the earth, the linden of Odeschalchi.

The people failed to preserve their land sacred from the foot of a stranger. The rivalry of Venice and Florence, of Genoa and Naples, of Ferrara and Milan, became such that Italians hated Italians more than they feared the Spaniard or the Swiss. Therefore, though hiring their own swords from state and state, they paid mercenaries to defend their freedom, and these mercenaries, coming as servants, remained as masters. Even when

the blood of Savoy cried out to 'avenge her slaughtered saints,' it was not to Sardinian or Savoyard, to Italian or Tyrolese, but to aliens, though honest aliens—Cromwell and the soldiers of the English revolution. So utterly was patriotism gone from every creature of the soil, that, as a witty writer said, the very dogs in Rome acquired a mangy, dull, and perfidious look. There was nothing to redeem this shame. In ancient Italy her worst days produced her most illustrious men—from Scipio to Cæsar; but even the Carbonari were inferior, and now, if Mazzini be excepted, the people all lie on the same blank and barren level.

The history of that country is a lesson on the value of peace. Peace is a blessing of incalculable worth; but there are things more dear than peace, and things more terrible than war. The turbulence of the republics was far more happy, more rich, more civilized than that reptile stupor which the ignorant admire because it resembles tranquillity. Better to hear the cry of factions in Bologna than the howl of dogs about its deserted dwellings. Better that the streets of Ferrara should be trampled, as once they were, by armed men, than that they should be, as now they are, overgrown by grass. As it was, the Bourbons spoiled what Goth and Vandal spared, and what escaped the Bourbons, the Austrians were industrious to destroy. Foreign batteries threaten the churches of Venice, and tyranny overclouds the serene and solemn beauty of the street of palaces in Genoa. The people of the Campagna now live in squalid huts covered with raw hides among the quarries, whence, in happier ages, they dug marble for their mansions and their villas. What else was to be hoped when at the Congress of Vienna, which settled the affairs of Europe, there was not one Italian to place on the treaty the seal of one free Italian state? Now, therefore, the whole region is miserable, and if it still be gay, its gaiety is like a masquerade in a ruin.

It has been said that the configuration, the climate, and the other natural characteristics of the peninsula render its enjoyment of freedom impossible. That they increase the difficulty we have admitted, but that they create an insuperable bar cannot be true, because it once enjoyed that freedom. There may be more truth in Rousseau's remark, that, once lost, it can never be regained. But that the climate may have affected the development of the people's genius is probable. According to one theory, there never was a poet in all the plain and city of Babylon, and none native to Egypt, because those are hot and level countries. There never was one on the fruitful banks of the Vistula, because they were flat and cold, nor among the dwellers along the Danube, though Ovid himself taught them an indigenous song. Poetry was scarcely ever found among the

inhabitants of plains, but among the mountains of Judea it sprang up as among the olives and thyme of Attica, and on the slopes of Argua and Fiesolè. The rich fields of Lombardy, though they have been the praise of many minstrels, have had none of their own. Boccacio sang, first on the Apennines and then on Vesuvius, but never was one note of ode or lyric heard in all the vale of Capua.

We leave this interesting idea, with its ingenious illustration, for future inquiry; but we introduced it here that our last speculation on Italy may not touch on the servitude which is her shame, but on the poetry which is her glory.

ART. VI.—*Ticonderoga; or, the Black Eagle.* By G. P. R. James. Second Edition. Three Vols. 8vo. London: T. C. Newby. 1854.

MR. JAMES'S fertility of invention and his unwearied industry have not failed him in his honourable exile. On the contrary, since his consulate in America carried him to new scenes, he has promptly availed himself of them to construct an American story which equals his best works in originality and spirit. Indian tales by American writers are common. Fenimore Cooper's have deservedly high celebrity; but their subjects date only in the period of American independence, as was becoming his thoroughly republican spirit. Others, such as the philosophical Miss Green, in her Indian poem, 'Nanuntenoo,' resort to the more ancient days of American discovery and settlement for their interest.

Mr. James, an Englishman, prefers a colonial story, running parallel to his real memoir of the 'American lady' of Mrs. Grant, of Laggan, which preceded the revolutionary excitements of 1776, when England was engaged in contests with the French in Canada and had important relations of war, and peace, and trade with the Indian tribes within and beyond our borders. The main interest of his work turns upon the fortunes of the family of an English gentleman, Mr. Prevost, settled in the backwoods of New York with his son and daughter. Their kindly qualities had won the close friendship of an Indian chief, the Black Eagle of the tribe, whose only child, called in Indian phrase the Blossom, became attached to the English settler's son. That attachment was mutual; and it aggravates the terrible incident that first excites the reader's sympathy. An Indian, whilst on the point of committing an outrageous act of vengeance, was put to death

by his intended victim, an American settler, designated Woodchuck, at the moment casually the companion of the younger Prevost. Hence arose a deadly feud, which according to native usage could not be appeased but with blood; and when the Indians failed in seizing the settler who had killed their countryman, they carried off his young companion in his stead. The long captivity of the youth, and the various events which lead to his ultimate release, furnish many details of Indian manners, of which the most remarkable is a sort of *freemasonry*, the superstitious respect for whose injunctions tended to save even the actual slayer of the Indian, Woodchuck himself, when he was ultimately made a prisoner.

This colonial hero of the work, the unlucky Woodchuck, is so called by the Indians his friends, after a cunning animal that could easily escape from its enemies by burrowing rapidly when in danger; like that little beast he had singular craft and success in evading the Indians' tricks. The title of captain was by colonial courtesy prefixed to his surname of Brooks. He is a type of the less educated among the old colonists—a compound of the log-hut squatter, the Indian trader, and even the trapper, but with the frank loyalty not uncommon before the war of independence which gives him decided originality, and distinguishes him broadly from Mr. Cooper's members of the same family of backwoodsmen of the later period. This was the man who shot the treacherous Indian to save his own scalp from the uplifted tomahawk, and who so brought the son of Mr. Prevost into mortal peril. His remorse at so dreadful an affliction to those he deeply respected, and his generous resolution and extraordinary efforts to save the life of the captured youth, furnish many touching descriptions, and some surprising incidents to the tale. Woodchuck's adoption by the Indian freemasonry, and his participation in the privileges of that mysterious body, arose from an act of kindness he had shown to an old Indian whom he found in the forest dangerously wounded by a moose deer. He saved the Indian's life, and having nursed him many weeks till his recovery, spent the winter at his lodge. This Indian was tattooed with the blue lines of initiation on his arm; and gracefully marked Woodchuck's arm with similar lines, saying that if he ever met any of the Five Nations tattooed like that, and spoke the word of recognition taught him, they would help him 'against their own father.'

Thus protected, Woodchuck, although under the penalty of the blood-feud, went confidently to the Indians, 'to set the poor boy free,' as he said; and he found protection in one of their superstitions against the doom that threatened his life at their hands under the influence of another. But the youth was saved by the

devoted affection of the Indian girl; and the powerful intervention of the Indian women of her tribe, who stopped the torture of the youth at the moment of its execution, by threatening to sacrifice their own lives with him, is an incident which if not founded on fact is certainly in harmony with Indian usage.

The Indian characters of the work are numerous, and well traced. The Black Eagle's story seems to be historical. His wife was a European captive, taken young in the massacre of a frontier village by his tribe. He had, in her presence, caused her father's dead body to be respected, and so, by conciliating her filial affection, he prepared the way to their marriage, which was solemnized by a missionary. She turns out to be a long-lost sister of Mr. Prevost, the settler, and the daughter of that marriage was the *Blossom* of the story, whose attachment to the younger Prevost, her unknown cousin, is the source of its most romantic interest. She lost her white mother young, but she had been brought up in the civilized habits which that mother introduced into the Indian chief's wigwam. Hence her own ultimate marriage with young Prevost violates no probability; and such unions certainly constitute one of those powerful means of conciliating different races, which, with the just administration of our intercourse with barbarous people, would neutralize all the difficulties usually attending that intercourse.

This incident of mixed marriages is curiously illustrated in the case of two eminent American colonial and Indian families, the Johnsons and Brants, too slightly mentioned by Mr. James. He is not insensible to the merits of Sir William Johnson, long the Superintendent of Indian Affairs before 1776, and whose son, Sir John Johnson, held the same post in Canada down to our days. Sir William is introduced into this story with effect, but his brilliant exploits on the Canadian frontier have been overshadowed by the glory of Wolfe and the conquest of Quebec. Mr. James should take advantage of his own residence in America to collect the abundant materials which exist for a record of his career, and that of the Brants, his Indian connexions. A life of Sir William Johnson, and memoirs of the Brants—the fictitious 'Monster Brant' of Campbell—and his children, written among the scenes where they were famous, would be a valuable contribution to the great work of Indian civilization, of which sciolists only despair.

These Brants sprang from a distinguished European family that allied itself to the Indians in the 17th century. The colonial characters beyond Woodchuck, and the Prevost family, are not many, nor striking; nor are our French rivals in Canada very happily portrayed.

The second interest of the story arises out of the attachment of

the English settler's daughter, Edith, to a superior officer in the British army, then serving in the colonies. This officer, Lord H., seems to be described after an original, the Lord Percy of the American annals of the last century. He is endowed with all the qualities that gain respect and win affection. As the marriage of young Prevost and the Blossom is the crowning happy event of this work, its great distresses are the untimely deaths of Lord H. and his affianced bride, Mr. Prevost's daughter, Edith. Both fell by rifle shots in our sanguinary failure at the French fort of Ticonderoga in 1758, from which the story takes its leading title. Lord H. received a mortal shot in the heat of the battle. Edith, saved suddenly at the close of this dreadful affray by her brother, who had been released by the Indians, was struck by a shot fired at her brother; she died in his arms, and was buried by the side of her lover at his soldier's funeral. 'In one thing they were happy;—neither, at the last hour of life, knew of the other's peril, or the other's fate.'

The elder Prevost's history is peculiar, and furnishes the author with a lesson of deep general interest—the ungrateful return too often made by governments and the country to men of merit in public life. The official reform just promised with a solemn note of preparation in the Queen's speech, gives an unexpected weight to that portion of the romance which opens with the following reflections from the mouth of the exile, Prevost:—

“Here am I, who for many arduous years laboured with zeal, such as few have felt, at sacrifices such as few have made, and with industry such as few have exerted, to benefit my kind and my country. That I did so, and with success, was admitted by all; even while others, starting in the career of life at the same time with myself, turned their course in the most opposite direction, pandered to vice, to folly, and even to crime, and trod a flowery and an easy way, with few of the difficulties and impediments that beset my path.

“And what has been the result? Even success has brought to me neither reward, nor honour, nor gratitude. On those who have neither so laboured, nor so striven, whose objects have been less worthy, whose efforts have been less great, recompences and distinctions have fallen thick and fast—a government's patronage—a sovereign's favour—a people's applause. And I am an exile on a distant shore; unthought of, unrecompensed, unremembered.”

“He paused with the pen in his hand, and the bitter and corroding thoughts of the neglect he had endured still busy in his mind, spreading into a thousand new channels, and poisoning all the sources of happiness within him. An old newspaper lay on the table. Newspapers were scarce in those days, and it had reached him tardily. Some accidental traveller through the wilderness had brought it to him lately, and he had found therein fresh proofs of the forgetfulness of friends—fresh evidence of the truth of the old axiom, “out of sight, out of mind.”

‘The perusal of this journal had given rise to the dark view of his own fate, and of human nature which he had just put upon record. His was not, in truth, a complaining spirit. It was not his nature to repine or to murmur. He had a heart to endure much, and to struggle on against obstacles: to take even bright and happy views: to rely upon friendship, and trust in God. It was only when some fresh burden was cast upon the load of ingratitude and falsehood he had met with, that a momentary burst of indignation broke from him—that the roused and irritated spirit spoke aloud. He had been a good friend, faithful, and true, and zealous. He had been a kind master, looking upon all around him as brethren, seeking their welfare and their happiness often more than his own. He had been a good subject, honoring and loving his sovereign, and obedient to the laws. He had been a good patriot, advocating by pen and voice (without fear, and without favour) all those measures which, from his very inmost heart, he believed were for his country’s welfare, and grudging neither time, nor exertion, nor labour, nor money, to support that party which he knew to be actuated by the same principles as himself.

‘But with all this, no one had ever sought to serve him. No one had ever thought of recompensing him. Many a friend had proved false, and neglected the best opportunity of promoting his interests: many, who had fed upon his bounty, or shared his purse, had back-bitten him in private, or maligned him in the public prints; and, though there were a few noble and generous exceptions, was it wonderful that there should be some bitterness in his heart, as he sat there in a lowly dwelling, in the midst of the woods of America, striving to carve a fortune from the wilderness for himself and his two children!’—
Vol. i. pp. 3-7.

The author takes care to do tardy justice to the martyr he has commiserated. As the tale passes on, Lord H. reports home the merits he has found buried in the American woods; and a high employment is given to the neglected colonist. Upon this change in the fortunes of a good man, Mr. James returns to the charge, and makes remarks which should be reflected upon in these days of promised official reforms.

‘Let us not look too curiously into the motives which induced Mr. Prevost, after some hesitation, and some reluctance, to accept the appointment offered to him by the government through Lord H——. It was pleasing to him to think that his merits, and the services of which he was conscious—though, be it said, not too conscious—had only been so long overlooked, not from being unapparent or forgotten, but because, in some of his views, he had differed from the ministers lately dismissed. He knew not—or, at least, he did not recollect—how easy it is to forget when one is not willing to remember; how rarely qualities are brought before the public gaze, except by interest, accident, or position—unless by impudence, arrogance, and self-sufficiency. One in ten thousand men of those who rise, rise by merit alone; though there must be some merit in almost all who rise. But

the really great are like fixed stars : few of the greatest are ever near the eye : one requires a telescope to see them, and that telescope is Time.

‘Putting aside military chiefs, who write their names in fire, many of the greatest men of all ages have been overlooked by Fame. The author of Job is unknown ; the builders of almost all great buildings of antiquity are nameless ; the sculptor of the one Venus, and the one Apollo—doubtful, doubtful—never recorded in history. Then look at the fate of others. Behold Friar Bacon and Galileo in their dungeons ; Dante proscribed and banished : Shakespere, a mere yeoman at Stratford ; Homer and Milton blind and poor ; Virgil, Petrarch, Verulum, the flatterers of a court ; Newton the Master of the Mint ! Heaven and earth ! what a catalogue of black spots upon the great leopard ! To hardly one of them did contemporary fame ascribe a place pre-eminent. Why, it is a salve and a comfort to every fool, and every driveller. No spawner of a penny pamphlet—with vanity enough—can be sure that he is not twin brother to the blind beggar of Greece.

‘But Mr. Prevost forgot all this. He was conscious of having laboured well and diligently in what he believed the right path : there was in him a sense and an experience of intellectual power : he had felt, and had exercised, the capability of guiding and directing others aright ; and, more than all, he had seen many a time the schemes which he had devised, the words which he had written or spoken, adopted—appropriated—filched—by others, and lauded, making the fame and the fortune of a weak, impudent, lucky charlatan, supported by interest, family, or circumstances, while the real author was forgotten, and would have been hooted had he claimed his own. This gave him some confidence in himself, independent of vanity ; and be it not for us to assay the metal too closely.’—Vol. ii. pp. 66-68.

The merit of this story, apart from its pleasing narrative, its picturesque situations, and its brilliant descriptions of nature’s sublime scenes, is twofold. It first aims at saving a wronged race—the American Indians—by setting in relief their many excellent qualities, acquired as well as natural. It then advocates warmly, as is just seen, the duty of the government in regard to the fitting appointment of public officers in the colonies. All the illustrations in the work respecting the aborigines are strictly applicable to the whole vast circle of our possessions beyond sea, now so often and so needlessly scenes of their utter ruin. The second point, that upon official appointments, belongs to home affairs as much as to those abroad ; and it is satisfactory that while the author is thus giving loose to his indignation at official corruption, he has struck upon theories not only at this moment of deep general interest, but sanctioned by the best efforts of our forefathers to improve the state. The excellent doctrine of this romance was literally enjoined 400 or 500 years ago in our statute book, requiring ministers to eschew ‘gifts and brocage, favour and affection,’ in

public appointments, and to fill all departments with the best men only. But it is still more satisfactory that at the very moment Mr. James is, with the efforts of his graceful pen, directing attention to hateful scandals which are condemned by the constitution, dry, solemn plans are actually forming to remove those scandals. Nor has the novelist a term of reproach, however strong, that equals the grave charges preferred by the official advocates of reform. 'Numerous instances might be given,' it is there urged, 'in which personal or political considerations have led to the appointment of men of very slender ability, and perhaps of questionable character, to situations of considerable emolument, over the heads of public servants of long-standing and undoubted merit.' (Report on the Organization of the Permanent Civil Service, p. 339).

This coincidence of a serious attempt in London to cut up 'jobbing and improper appointments by the roots' (ib. p. 341), with Mr. James's eloquent denunciation of the same abuses, is not without signification. Long ago Mr. James published the valuable letters of Secretary Vernon, applauding a bill of 1699, *to purify public appointments*; but which object Mr. Vernon calls 'Utopian' (Vol. ii. p. 305). It will be a poor proof of our progress in reform, if we cannot realize in this nineteenth century a wise principle, embodied in the above-cited statute law in the fourteenth, and ever since, from age to age, the subject of warm eulogy!

ART. VII.—*The Past and Future of Hungary.* Being Facts, Figures, and Dates, illustrative of its Past Struggles and Future Prospects.

By C. F. Henningsen, Esq. London: T. C. Newby.

2. *The History of Hungary and the Magyars, from the Earliest Period to the Close of the late War.* By Edwin Lawrence Godkin. London: John Cassell.

It was in spring, 1852, that Kossuth, on his great crusade in America, reached New England and the hallowed places of Transatlantic liberty, as sacred to every American as Marathon and Salamis are to the Old World. The eloquence of the great Hungarian chief became more glowing through the inspiration engendered by the trophies of civil and religious liberty. His glance was not only turned to the past, but likewise to the future, and his hand tried to raise the veil which conceals coming events. In Salem, May 6, he exclaimed:—

'All sophistry is in vain, gentlemen; there can be no mistake about it. Russian absolutism and Anglo-Saxon constitutionalism are not

rival, but antagonist powers, they cannot long continue to subsist together. Antagonists cannot hold equal positions; every additional strength of the one is a comparative weakening of the other. One or the other must yield, one or the other must perish or become dependent on the other's will.'—Kossuth's Select Speeches, p. 303.

In the course of his speech he proceeded to argue that Russian policy is essentially encroaching and warlike; that to be feared is often more important to Russia than to enjoy a particular market; that the Russian system of commerce is and must be one of prohibition to republican traffic; that England alone in Europe has large commerce with America; and that the despots, if victorious on the continent, would make it their great object to damage, cripple, and ruin both these kindred constitutional nations. He continued:—

'The despots are scheming to muzzle the English lion. You see already how they are preparing for this blow, that Russia may become mistress of Constantinople, by Constantinople mistress of the Mediterranean, and by the Mediterranean of three quarters of the globe.

'Constantinople is the key to Russia. To be preponderant she knows it is necessary for her to be a maritime power. Without the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, the Black Sea is only a lake, like the Caspian or Lake Aral, and the Baltic is frozen five months in the year. These are all the seas she possesses. Constantinople is the key to the palace of the Czars. Russia is already omnipotent on the continent: once master of the Mediterranean, it is not difficult to see that the power which already controls three quarters of the world, will soon have the fourth quarter.'—*Ib.* p. 307.

When (May 14th) in Faneuil Hall, Boston, which the Americans call the cradle of liberty, he drew a picture of the condition of Europe, and concluded by an account of the strength of Turkey which has been well authenticated by subsequent events. He predicted the struggle which is now raging on the Danube. 'The more Russia delays,' he said, 'the stronger Turkey becomes, and therefore is Russia in haste to fulfil the destiny of being a maritime power. You can now see why is my fear that this week, this month, or this year Russia will attack Turkey, and we shall not be entirely prepared.'

But whilst Kossuth was predicting the coming events, of which he saw already the shadow cast before them, the professional politicians of Europe and America laughed at what they called his visionary schemes. From the times of Cassandra it has always been the fate of the seers to be derided by the so-called practical men, who, because their attention is riveted to the details of routine, never can comprehend any great question before they are inextricably involved in its difficulties. The events happened just as Kossuth predicted them. Montenegro, the vanguard of Russia,

attacked Turkey suddenly and without provocation, and yet nobody believed that the Czar would be bold enough to disturb the peace of Europe by plans involving his advance to Constantinople. The Montenegrine outbreak was put down at the advice of Colonel Rose,—disapproved at the Foreign-office,—before it could become the object of diplomatic notes. The mission of the Austrian Count Leiningen could only avert the capture of the capital of the semi-independent robber-state. Russian influence received a serious check by Turkish valour, and still nobody would believe in war. The Czar, to restore his prestige, weakened by the defeat of his devoted Montenegrines, sent Prince Mentschikoff to Constantinople, in order to pick a quarrel on any ground, to bully the Sultan in his own palace, and to enforce the dismissal of his minister. And the practical politicians of Europe entered into the squabbles of the Greek and Latin monks, about the key of the sanctuaries in Jerusalem, and the inscription of the silver star of Bethlehem, as if the question were that of the rights and privileges of the Greek and Latin churches in the Turkish empire, and not that of Russian supremacy.

This question was at last settled by the Sultan; but the difficulties grew more serious with every new concession, and yet European diplomacy could not believe that it was the key to the Turkish empire which had been demanded by Prince Mentschikoff, and that the silver star at the chapel of Bethlehem was to lead the Russian armies across the Pruth to the banks of the Danube. They came and occupied the Principalities without a blow, since Colonel Rose, who had suggested to the Sultan that Omer Pasha should likewise cross the Danube, and occupy the fertile plains of Wallachia, whilst Russia was taking possession of Moldavia, was not now at Constantinople. The cautious Lord Redcliffe, always in the hope of checking Russian encroachments by diplomatic action, recommended the Porte not to take the invasion of the two rich provinces for a *casus belli*, and English ministers declared in Parliament their full confidence in the moderation and the honour of the Czar. At last they could not doubt; they had been outwitted, and war was declared by the Porte. Yet Anglo-French diplomacy, instead of letting loose the revolutionary elements contained in Russia, instead of arousing the emigrant Poles to organize themselves, and of supplying the Circassians with arms, continued to court the worthless alliance of Austria and Prussia. If seriously intent on checking Russia, these powers might easily do so; but if, on the other hand, they are acting a treacherous part, they hamper the free action of England and France much more than a Russian army of two hundred thousand men. These powers which, from the discontent of

their subjects, are unable to render efficient assistance to Russia, but from their fear of revolutions are unwilling to go against the Czar, might have been safely left to themselves, unable and unwilling as they are to affect in any way the issue of the question. And in order to keep the two powers of Central Europe aloof from Russia, to which they are attached by gratitude for the past and fear for the future, the English ministry shuns the representatives of continental liberty, and looks with distrust upon the crushed nationalities which might take advantage of the present war for establishing their claims to independence. Whilst they are attacking Russia as the representative of despotism in the name of continental liberty, the liberty of the continent is to be kept down by them. Lord Palmerston, in his speech at the Reform Club, praises the Sultan for having refused to give up Kossuth and the Hungarian refugees in 1849, at the risk of a threatened war, whilst he is courting the alliance of the same jealous and faithless power which claimed those heroes of liberty from the Turks in order to have them hung! The government is fully aware that such a course is not popular with the English nation, that the English officers are ashamed to call Austrian women-floggers their brothers-in-arms, still it persists in such a course, and does not prevent that—as it is reported in the ‘Times’—France, at the instance of Austria, requires the Piedmontese government to remove the Italian refugees from the frontiers, and to have the liberty of the press restricted in Turin. And this system of compromise with principles, has it, after all, ever had any serious result? Will Austria join heartily the western powers? Has she forgotten the gratitude she owes to the Czar? And can she be trusted by her new friends in the very moment when she is turning against her old friend in need? These are serious questions which are not yet solved, though Lord Clarendon declared that Austria *has* joined the western powers, and Drouyn de L’huys, that she *will* do it. But the semi-official ‘Vienna Gazette’ protests against either of those assertions of the English and French Secretaries for Foreign Affairs, and, like an oracle of old, declares that Austria will, at the right time, take care of the best interests of her own. People in Vienna, London, and Paris, waiting anxiously for the solution of this question, weigh now the interests of Austria minutely, and try to find out which balance is to sink, whether the Russian or the English alliance. For, if it is sure that England and France may easily destroy Austria by countenancing the patriots of Hungary and Poland, it is likewise certain that their governments would do it most reluctantly. Politicians of the stamp of Louis Napoleon and of Lord Aberdeen and his colleagues are not the men to become the friends of Kossuth and

Mazzini. On the other side, nobody can doubt that if Russia has sufficient reason to suspect the bad faith of Austria towards her, the Czar can and will upset the whole fabric of the Austrian empire with one single word—*Panslavism*—which never fails to find an echo in the mountains of Bohemia and the plains of Galicia, along the course of the Save, and on the banks of the lower Danube,—on the shores of the Adriatic, and in the valleys of the Julian Alps.

Whatever decided course Austria may take, she is lost. Perdition awaits her if joining Russia, perdition if going with England and France. Her only policy is, apparently, to join the western powers, and to clog their movements in the interest and with the permission of the Czar. Her only part is that of the intriguing traitor; she has entered a course of wickedness and she cannot retrace her steps; her actions do not bear the light of publicity.

It would be unjust, if, in passing such a judgment, which is at variance with the officially expressed opinions of the ministers of England and France, we should be guided only by personal sympathies and antipathies. When speaking of the future policy of Austria, we cannot trust any other guide than the history of the past. Families, as well as individuals, have a certain character and tradition to which they cling; so even nations do not lose their principal features. The French of to-day have retained many of the characteristic features of the Gauls, as described by Cæsar. The English of the past centuries resemble in many respects the English of the present day. But still more than they, the court and government of Austria—for there is no Austrian nation, and there never has been such a nation—has always remained the same, from the time of its foundation by Rudolph of Hapsburgh down to the present moment: for the female line of Lorraine, now on the throne, clings to the traditional policy of the original stock. Professor Newman has, in his 'Crimes of the House of Austria,' in an able and most impressive way, collected evidence of the general tendency of the Hapsburghs to destroy popular liberty, to set at nought all the oaths which guaranteed the rights of the nations who had called them to the throne, and denounced their avowed hatred of civil and religious freedom, of representative forms, and of liberty of conscience. They were such in Spain, in Belgium, in Germany, in Bohemia, in Poland, and in Hungary. Professor Newman's publication is what it promised to be, a short, but honest, epitome of the crimes of the House of Austria.

We have now before us two other works, written without the peculiar aim of showing up the duplicity of the Hapsburgh dynasty, 'The Illustrated History of Hungary and the Magyars,' by Mr. Godkin, and 'The Past and Future of Hun-

gary,' by C. F. Henningsen. Mr. Godkin's book is an able and straightforward, though in minor details sometimes not entirely correct* picture of Hungarian history, written with clearness, earnestness, and impartiality, without any bias against Austria. We extract from it the judgment passed on the successive kings of the House of Hapsburgh and Lorraine, as illustrating the character of the race upon whose sincerity the hopes of the present administration are founded. Of the family he says :—

'No other of the reigning families of Europe has withstood the shocks and revolutions of the last ten (read six) centuries, with the same audacious confidence in its own destiny, and with equal exemption of all the ordinary consequences of folly, injustice, and oppression—we can hardly point to one (of the family) who displayed any proper sense of his responsibilities to the people whom he governed.'—p. 48.

'After the battle of Mohács,' says the author, 'the spirit of Hungary was broken by the ravages of the Turks; and torn by dissensions from within, she was forced to cast herself at the feet of Austria, and merge her history in that of a family of despots. The principle of election now gave way to that of hereditary descent, and more than this, singular complications arose in the working of the legislative machinery, from the fact that the king was no longer a national monarch. He had other states and other interests to attend to; he could, if necessary, by the subsidies and military force of his other dominions, render himself quite independent of the supplies or remonstrances of the diet. The consequence of this was, that the National Assembly had its attention altogether diverted from its proper sphere of duty. It felt itself responsible for the rights and liberties of the nation. It felt that these liberties were viewed with a jealous eye by a powerful and ambitious neighbour, the head of a foreign nation—and that neighbour their own king. It directed its whole energies, therefore, to the single task of watching him, of counteracting his intrigues by other intrigues not less mischievous. From standing constantly on the defensive, it became violently conservative, and saw in every change an attack upon its privileges. The written constitution was an object of deep dislike to the Austrian emperors, who in their hereditary states were accustomed to no such restraints, but the more they

* For instance: the celebrated saying—'Faciam Hungariam captivam, postea mendicam, deinde catholicam,' is attributed wrongly to Cardinal Kollonics (page 244); it was the minister Prince Lobkoviez who uttered it. Martinovics and his friends did not 'distribute revolutionary tracts on a vast scale.' The Citizen's Catechism, a translation of Gerard 'Catéchisme de la Révolution,' was circulated in one only MS. copy amongst the conspirators (page 289). They have likewise never been in correspondence with the chiefs of the Mountain in Paris. Szirmay told it, but this charge was not substantiated. The portrait of Baron Wesselényi is (page 295) by a strange mistake given as the likeness of Count Széchenyi. Klapka did not offer his sword to the Assembly in Vienna; he was not in Vienna at the time of the siege, and therefore could not have strengthened its fortifications (page 329).

sought to overturn it, the more fondly and fiercely did the Hungarians cling to it.'—p. 50.

Tired of the tyranny and perfidy of Rudolph, the Hungarians rose in insurrection under Stephen Bocskay in 1604, defeated the emperor, and concluded in 1606 the treaty of Vienna, which guaranteed the constitution and religious freedom.

In reference to the reign of Ferdinand the Second, we quote only the following passage:—

'When he ascended the throne, he refused to confirm the privileges which his father, Charles, had granted to the Protestants of his dominions in Styria. He made a pilgrimage to Loretto, and vowed on his knees before the image not to desist from his efforts until he had extirpated heresy in his dominions; and at Rome his zeal was fired and confirmed by consecration at the hands of Pope Clement VIII. On his return, he banished all protestant preachers and schoolmasters. In place of protestant seminaries, he founded colleges of Jesuits; and commissioners, by his orders, traversed the whole country, restoring the old churches to the catholics, and demolishing the new ones, and the school-houses, which the reformers had erected.'—p. 197.

Of course, the Hungarians rose again under Gabriel Bethle. They defeated the emperor, and concluded the peace of Nickolsburg in 1627, by which that of Vienna was confirmed:

'The reign of Leopold was a period which witnessed events more important to Hungary than any which preceded it, or have followed it, save only the revolutionary years, 1848 and 1849. No monarch of the house of Austria has ever made so determined attacks upon Hungarian liberty, and to none did the Hungarians oppose a braver and more strenuous resistance. Nothing was left untried on the one side to overthrow the constitution; nothing was left on the other side to uphold and defend it. Few in England know anything of the result; fewer still the steps which led to it; and even those whose position or pursuits have made them acquainted with the facts, have formed their judgment not so much from an impartial weighing of them, as in obedience to the dictates of passion or hereditary prejudice. The Hungarians look upon their struggles with Leopold as a patriotic defence of privileges legitimized by a thousand years of possession; and the partisans of the house of Austria, on the other hand, inveigh against them as the efforts of a restless and tumultuous people to free themselves from the control of their lawful rulers. Unhappily, this is not one of those questions upon which the present generation, looking at it in the light of history, can form an impartial and unbiassed opinion. Blood has flowed in our own time in the old quarrel of the seventeenth century. Neither party has retreated from the struggle in despair, and poured out its sorrows and regrets in the bosom of tradition. The vanquished are not subdued; the conquerors are not triumphant. Success has not lent lustre and legitimacy to rebellion; but the sword cannot root out the chagrin of defeat and the hope of revenge.'—p. 205.

The Hungarians conspired against Leopold, the Palatine Wesselényi, the Counts Zrinyi, Nádasdy, and Frangepan, being at the head of the conspiracy; but their schemes were discovered after the sudden death of their principal leader; the conspirators were captured and executed. Again the nation rose under Emeric Tököly, and was defeated, and once more under Prince Francis Rákóczy. The war lasted for several years, and was at length concluded by the mediation and good offices of England and the Dutch States-General, in 1709.

‘Under Leopold,’ says Mr. Godkin, ‘many of the proudest families in the kingdom, who could trace their descent from the days of Arpád; and who lived amidst their vassals in regal splendour, had been utterly extirpated by Caraffa, and their houses left desolate, or occupied by troops. Their places were now filled up by the German minions of the court, or by brutal soldiers who had distinguished themselves by their unrelenting ferocity, and who, void of all sympathy with the people, did everything in their power for the overthrow of the constitution. The administration of justice in the courts became a mockery, a delusion, and a snare. Bribery, corruption, and intimidation, took the place of law. The Iazyges and Cumans, who had been entitled to all the privileges of the nobility, and the inhabitants of many of the free towns and boroughs, were sold into serfdom to the Teutonic Knights, who exacted their dues with such terrible severity, that mothers disposed of their children to the Turks to procure funds to meet them. Thousands of peasants every month crossed the Turkish frontier, preferring to brave all the insolence and oppression of the Moslems, to living under the tyranny of those of their own faith.’—p. 243.

Charles (the Third as King of Hungary, the Sixth as Emperor of Germany) ‘was induced by Russia, in 1736, to break through the peace of Passarowitz, and to enter into an offensive alliance against the Turks’ (p. 265). He joined in the war of Russia against the Sultan, after having, for several months, acted as mediator between the contending parties.

For Maria Theresa, Mr. Godkin has a peculiar admiration. He describes her as ‘one of the most remarkable sovereigns who have ever appeared in any age and in any country.’ ‘There are few graces, whether of mind or body, which can lend a charm to womanhood that she did not possess.’ Yet even of her, who had been saved by the loyalty and enthusiasm of the Hungarians, in her struggle against the combined forces of Prussia, Germany, and France, he must acknowledge that ‘she managed very ably and judiciously to hide her *insidious attacks* upon the constitution, by the introduction of a number of really useful reforms.’ ‘So thorough, in short, was the influence which this wonderful woman gained over them (the Hungarians), that she never summoned the diet more than three times during her long reign

of forty years, and habitually disregarded those constitutional forms which the natives had ever preserved with the most watchful jealousy.' (pp. 279, 280.)

'Her son Joseph acknowledged the rights and privileges of the States in a circular letter, but he nevertheless refused to go through the ceremony of coronation, because he was determined to destroy them, and consequently would not confirm them by an oath. . . . He also abolished the use of the Latin and Hungarian languages, and permitted the German only to be used in all public offices. He destroyed the whole municipal system of the country, upon which the natives, with justice, looked as the great safe-guard of their liberties. County meetings were forbidden, as also the election of county officers; the local courts were abolished, and the forms, usages, and times of assembling were so entirely different in those that were established to supply their place, that the whole judicial system was thrown into a state of confusion, through which not even the practitioners could find their way, and the proscription of the two languages, in which all the charters and other official documents were framed, naturally inspired the natives with the fear that this was but the prelude to the total abolition of their simplest privileges.'—p. 285.

'As to Francis I.,' the author says, 'the most audacious of all those who joined in framing the Holy Alliance was the Emperor of Austria. The Hungarians reminded him, in 1815, of his repeated promises to redress their grievances, while they were voting him men and money to defend his capital against the assaults of Napoleon. He could not deny the promises, but he emphatically declined to fulfil them. They asked him to convoke the diet, but he had never had any great liking for the diet, and now had less than ever; for it was one of those institutions in which the despots saw most danger to themselves. He therefore determined to dispense with it for the future.'—p. 293.

The more recent events of the son and grandson of Francis, Ferdinand V. and Francis Joseph, are sufficiently known, if not by Lord Aberdeen, who calls the murderer of Arad and Pest 'the young hope of his country,' at least by the people of England at large.

C. F. Henningsen, a distinguished English military man, aide-de-camp to Zumala Carreguy, and secretary to Kossuth, has condensed the events of this later period under the title of 'The Past and Future of Hungary,' an easily readable little volume, which contains the best summary of the Hungarian campaigns. He wrote it originally for the 'Democratic Review' in America, and had it reprinted here in England. Nobody who reads the statement can believe that there ever could be reconciliation between Hungary and Austria. A nation vanquished may submit to the conquerors, and even be amalgamated with them, but the Hungarians do not feel themselves conquered by Austria; they were, up to the last, triumphant against them, whom they

despise as much as they hate. The Austrian Emperor, therefore, cannot derive any real strength from the most important portion of his dominions. Russia knows this well, and can make use of the discontent, and she will do it. In order to acquaint the English public with the real views of the Czar, we conclude this review of the weakness, wickedness, and treachery of Austria, by an important letter, as yet unpublished, recently addressed by a Russian diplomatist to an American gentleman of great political influence, as it discloses the power and the views of Russia to act upon the nations of Europe and America :—

‘It is now two years since I ventured to observe that France and England would ultimately unite and become a formidable thorn to America in naval affairs; and I cannot but think things are rapidly working to bring about my prediction. It has become my lot for fifty years and upwards to watch the continuous changes which have taken place in the world’s government, and I have seen with sorrow the all-powerful influence of England in keeping back improvement, under the delusive plea that her “glorious constitution” was the acme of human invention, and that man must be taught to see or feel the truth by every possible means which its aristocratic rulers could devise. I quite agree with a distinguished member of the late government of England, when he pronounced the Whigs an “organized hypocrisy,” and I should not be doing justice to my experience if I did not consider this the most appropriate definition of her glorious constitution, of which the ill-informed subjects of her Majesty boast so much. Russia is not blind to this fact, and the time has arrived when she feels herself prepared to prove that she will no longer submit to be duped by the crafty statesmen of her once faithful ally.

‘No sensible man can for a single moment believe that England feels any further interest for the unfortunate Turk, than what serves her *special* purpose; and she has been using her exertions and influence in every quarter, to make it appear that she is the defender of the weak against the strong. How far France collectively believes her I know not, but it serves the purpose of the present emperor to act in concert with her under this barefaced presumption. The late king of France purchased his right to wear the Crown from England, and Napoleon very clearly treads in the path of his predecessor, and, most probably, will share the same fate for his folly.

‘What, in the name of common sense, has France to do with keeping England’s door to India? We all know how India was subjugated by England; and we all know also, that England could not play the high game of dictator, if India were separated from her grasp; and I must again repeat, what has France to do with it, further than it serves the immediate purpose of the emperor?

‘I am not going to advocate the right of Russia to subdue Turkey; at the same time, I cannot see how England has a right to expect that Russia will remain a passive witness to England’s triumphs, to her injury in common with that of all other countries which have been

obliged to submit to her absolute pleasure. Russia has the power to liberate the world from England's grasp if she has the virtue and courage to do so. If she pleases, she can free Poland, and all that part of Europe on the Adriatic shores, and form them into confederate governments to her advantage; securing at the same time the shores of the Black Sea, so as to have a free passage to the sea in that quarter; and by uniting Prussia with Denmark on the one side, and Sweden and Norway on the other side, in confederate union with herself, keep an open door for her shipping in the Baltic; but she will not be able to absorb those countries and amalgamate them with Russia, even if she wishes it: and, further, England and France would ultimately liberate Europe, rather than that Russia should conquer any portion of it. Russia is the best friend America has at this moment, and America can help her in the work of *regeneration*. America has money, and Russia is in want of it, and no doubt Russia will be glad to contract a debt with America at the rate of six per cent.—not by obtaining cash, *but for cash worth in ships, and the means of keeping up the war with those who oppose her*. America can build her ships to any extent, large and *small*, and American ships can take out Russian seamen for them, as passengers, and which neither France nor England can prevent. England would break with France to-morrow, could she go back to her original position with Russia, but this she must not be permitted to do, if the world has a *right to be free*!

'She fears America, but she does not respect her; and I trust the people of the United States are not blind to this fact; and they never had a better opportunity than they have at this moment to teach England to understand her duty. Had Napoleon the will, he also has the chance of being handed down to posterity as another Washington, and you probably know how his uncle regretted the loss of this chance; and, if he is a wise man, he will not let it slip from his grasp, although England will try hard, and kiss his foot to prevent it.

'America surely has some friends in France who can venture to advise him at this dangerous moment, before he involves himself in further troubles, and it is very clear that he is surrounded with danger of no common character.'

It is hardly necessary to point to the importance of this letter, which shows that Russian diplomacy avails itself of revolution and republicanism in the same unscrupulous way as of the despotic tendencies of the German princes.

Since the above has been written, we have, by the publication of the secret and confidential correspondence, obtained the evidence of the Czar himself, that 'the interests of Austria and Russia are identical, and that it is superfluous to treat with Austria, as she is bound to Russia.' And yet the alliance of Austria is courted by the government! Indeed, the old monastic adage: '*Mundus vult decipi, decipiatur ergo*,' seems still to be in force among the diplomatists of Europe.

ART. VIII.—*Census of Great Britain, 1851. Religious Worship. England and Wales.* Report and Tables presented to both Houses of Parliament. London: Printed by George E. Eyre and William Spottiswoode, printers to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty. For Her Majesty's Stationery Office. 1853.

2. *The Same.* Abridged from the Official Report made by Horace Mann, Esq., to George Graham, Esq., Registrar-General. Eleventh Thousand. (Revised.) Routledge and Co. 1854.

MEN of all parties—in all countries—are likely to be interested in the important document drawn up by Mr. Horace Mann, on the 'State of Religious Worship in England and Wales.' To English Christians—those especially who are friends of liberty and progress—it will prove in many respects invaluable. The Report and Tables presented to parliament will be studied with deep interest by leading minds; and the admirable abridgment, so wisely made, will diffuse the information thus collected generally throughout the entire community. For the first time in the history of England, we have now an authentic report, as complete as it was likely or possible to be, of the number of persons attending places of public worship, the number of places provided for that purpose, and the particular doctrines and forms of the parties by whom these provisions have been made.

To none can these returns be more welcome, more gratifying, or more suggestive, than to those who maintain the principles of freedom in relation to worship, which have so long been advocated in the 'Eclectic [Review].' We have read Mr. Horace Mann's Report to the Registrar-General with more than common interest; and we shall now lay before our readers a simple statement of what it contains, for the purpose of urging on their attention some of the many truths established or illustrated by these contents.

The elaborate means employed for collecting the returns are fully described in the appendix to the Report (pp. clxix.-clxxvi.) The collection was made by no fewer than *thirty thousand six hundred and ten officers*, called enumerators, under the direction of the 2190 registrars of births and deaths in England and Wales. The information was obtained *without compulsion*. Forms or schedules were distributed by the enumerators; from these 34,467 returns were received, after much time and labour; and the information omitted in any of these returns is, in part, supplied separately by analogy or supposition. In reference to them,

Mr. Mann says—‘It may safely be said, however, that the instances which seemed to call for supplementation are too few to render it important whether the principles by which it has been regulated are in all respects correct. The object sought will probably be deemed sufficiently accomplished if the *aggregate* results are made to represent by these means more completely and correctly than would otherwise be the case, the nature and amount of the accommodation for religious worship in the country.’

From the whole of these returns it appears that the population of England and Wales on March 30th, 1851, was SEVENTEEN MILLIONS, NINE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVEN THOUSAND, SIX HUNDRED AND NINE. Of this population there were, *on that day*, TEN MILLIONS, EIGHT HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIX THOUSAND, AND SIXTY-SIX PERSONS, attending public worship in THIRTY-FOUR THOUSAND, FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVEN places. Of these 10,896,066 attendants, less than half—5,292,551—belonged to the Church of England; more than half—5,603,515—belonged to other professions. Of this majority of 5,603,515, the largest numbers are *Wesleyan Methodists*, 1,544,528; *Independents*, 1,214,059; *Baptists*, (particular) 740,752; *Primitive Methodists*, 511,195; *Roman Catholics*, 383,630. The other religious bodies are much smaller than these five:—ranging from 83 (Seventh-Day Baptists) to 22,000, of the Society of Friends; 50,000 Unitarians; 10,874 Moravians; 99,045 New Connexion Methodists; 91,503 Wesleyan Reformers; 264,000 Calvinistic Methodists; 35,000 Latter-Day Saints or Mormons, &c.

Besides this broad view of England and Wales, the compiler has drawn up separate Tables showing the accommodation and attendance in the Registration Districts of London—South-Eastern Counties,—South-Midland Counties,—Eastern Counties,—South-Western Counties,—West-Midland Counties,—North-Midland Counties,—North-Western Counties,—Yorkshire,—Northern Counties,—and Welsh Counties; each of the separate counties of England; and North and South Wales; *dates* at which existing places of worship in each county were erected, or appropriated to religious uses;—the number of the places of worship and sittings in the several dioceses of England and Wales;—an alphabetical arrangement of the religious accommodation and attendance in more than seventy large towns and boroughs;—the accommodation provided by various religious bodies in *large town districts*, as compared with the rest of England;—the accommodation provided in each *county* of England and Wales by the most numerous religious bodies;—the *proportion of sittings to population* in the registration divisions, counties, and districts of England and Wales;—and the amount

still required ;—districts with *most* and *least* accommodation respectively ;—comparative position of the Church of England and the dissenting churches in different parts of the country ;—the number of services held by each religious body at different periods of the day ;—comparative view of the frequency with which the various religious bodies make use of the accommodation provided for them respectively ;—and the number of persons present at the most numerous attended services on Sunday, March 30th, 1851.

In addition to these exceedingly valuable tables, there is one of the number of places of worship, sittings, and attendants connected with the various religious bodies of England and Wales, arranged in *registration districts or poor law unions*.

Upon these Tables the Report is based. Most of our readers, we should hope, will agree with Mr. Mann in the following estimate of the importance of the subject :—

‘ Perhaps it would be difficult to over-estimate the importance of authentic facts upon this subject ; since, for many reasons, the religion of a nation must be matter of extreme solicitude to many minds. Whether we regard a people merely in their secular capacity as partners in a great association for promoting the stability, the opulence, the peaceful glory of a state, or view them in their loftier character, as subjects of a higher kingdom,—swift and momentary travellers towards a never-ending destiny ; in either aspect, the degree and the direction of religious sentiment in a community are subjects of the weightiest import : in the one case to the temporal guardians of a nation—to its spiritual teachers on the other. Statesmen—aware to what a great extent the liberty or bondage, industry or indolence, prosperity or poverty, of any people, are the fruits of its religious creed, and knowing also how extensively religious feelings tinge political opinions—find an accurate acquaintance with the various degrees and forms in which religious sentiment is manifested, indispensable to a correct appreciation either of the country’s actual condition or of its prospective tendency ; and equally essential to enable them to legislate with safety upon questions where religious principles or prejudices are inextricably involved. Nor yet to Christian ministers and teachers, and the Christian church in general, can facts like those now published fail to be of utmost interest ; since here, in the rise and progress of new sects, they see what novel forms of error need to be encountered, and, perhaps, what new developments of truth require to be received ; while, in the numbers of our population destitute of spiritual teaching, and without the means of gaining it, they see in what direction and to what extent their zealous efforts for diffusing true religion are demanded.’—Report, p. viii.

In recapitulating the substance of the Tables, we are told that in England and Wales, the number of native and indigenous communities is *twenty-seven*, besides some isolated congregations

not sufficiently numerous or consolidated to be called 'sects.' Of these communities, we have the following clear and historical arrangement:—

PROTESTANT CHURCHES.

BRITISH.

Church of England and Ireland.

Scottish Presbyterians:—*Church of Scotland. United Presbyterian Synod. Presbyterian Church in England.*

Independents, or Congregationalists.

Baptists:—*General. Particular. Seventh Day. Scotch. New Connexion General.*

Society of Friends.

Unitarians.

Moravians, or United Brethren.

Wesleyan Methodists:—*Original Connexion. New Connexion. Primitive Methodists. Bible Christians. Wesleyan Association. Independent Methodists. Wesleyan Reformers.*

Calvinistic Methodists:—*Welsh Calvinistic Methodists. Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion.*

Sandemanians, or Glassites.

New Church.

Brethren.

FOREIGN.

Lutherans.—German Protestant Reformers.—Reformed Church of the Netherlands.—French Protestants.

OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

Roman Catholics.—Greek Church.—German Catholics.—Italian Reformers.—Catholic and Apostolic Church.—Latter-day Saints, or Mormons.

JEWS.

The multiplicity of these communities may be viewed as advantageous on the side of private judgment actively exercised, or as disadvantageous to the interest of visible ecclesiastical unity. Some will be disposed to regard them as embodying much more substantial harmony in the support of common truths than the extreme advocates of any party would be disposed to acknowledge, and as probably suggesting to all parties the desirableness of better understanding the true grounds of separation from one another. With a view to help them in this matter, Mr. Mann has devoted more than a hundred well written and closely-printed pages to a succinct history of the several churches and societies, with authentic accounts of their characteristic doctrines, government, and usages. In this survey, the ecclesiastical history of England, from the introduction of Christianity to the present time, is narrated in a spirit remarkable for

fairness and accurate regard for truth. The tale is well and plainly told ; and we envy not the man who can read it without rejoicing that so much religious vitality has been at work both in the expression and in the formation of our national character. Whatever minute errors there may be, the means of correction are suggested in the notes and references. It is a good thing to have even an approximation towards a full account of what it is that these five and thirty communities are teaching, and in what degree they enlighten or modify the minds of the English people ; and foreigners especially, whose curiosity is sure to be attracted by these public and authenticated documents, will trace perhaps with an interest different from ours the historical connexion between institutions becoming gradually free, and the manifestations of religious sentiment augmenting in energy and independence.

With great caution, yet with intelligent liberality, the writer of the Report has shown the substantial agreement of the larger bodies in the essentials of religious truth ; while the freedom and self-reliance of the English people, manifest in the existence of separate societies, and conferring 'on none the artificial value which results from prohibition,' gives rise to the expectation that 'the spirit of uncompromising peace will gain yet further potency—that liberty to separate on minor, will beget still more the disposition to unite on greater, questions—and that the Toleration Act will be proved in its results to have been the most effective Act of Uniformity.' Among the proofs of this tendency are found the operations of sixteen societies for religious objects which include in their constituencies the members of perhaps a dozen different sects, and the number of such societies is much more likely to increase than to lessen.

In ascertaining the amount of provision for Christian worship in England and Wales, it is, of course, important to determine the proportion of the population—17,927,609—that require accommodation. By omitting 3,000,000 children, 1,000,000 invalids and aged persons, 3,278,039 legitimately absent in charge of houses, and an undefined number of persons employed in connexion with public conveyances, it is calculated that 58 per cent. of the entire population, amounting to 10,398,013 persons, are *always* able to attend public worship in this country, and that for this number accommodation ought to be provided. The provision for this number must, of course, be so *distributed* as to be available by all who require it.

Compared with the requirement, the existing deficiency in the whole of England and Wales is not more than 185,450, '*if the entire provision now existing is found to be so well distributed over the country as that no part has too little and no*

part too much; but the *actual* distribution shows a deficiency of accommodation *within reach of those who want it*, for probably more than 1,644,734. The inequalities of distribution are most striking. The City of London has a superfluity of 13,338 sittings; while in Shoreditch the deficiency is 43,755. And, speaking generally, the *urban* population have accommodation for 46 per cent., while the *rural* population have accommodation for 65·5 per cent. The proportion is *in inverse ratio to the size of the towns*:—so that 80 per cent. of the additional accommodation is required for sixty boroughs.

The rate of supply for this large want of accommodation is described as not being altogether unsatisfactory, inasmuch as it has been rapidly gaining on the increase of population for the last thirty years; but, so *unequal* is the distribution of this increased accommodation that, while seventy in a hundred may now be accommodated in the *rural* population, the increase of population in our *towns* has been at the rate of 156 per cent., while the increase of accommodation for worship has been only at the rate of 65 per cent.—The proportion of *free* accommodation appears to be 43·6 per cent. in the town districts, and 49·4 per cent. in rural districts.

In comparing the Church of England with other protestant communities, all *taken together*, it appears that the Church of England provides 5,317,915 sittings, or 29·6 per cent. for the entire population of 17,927,609.

‘Dissenters most abound in *Wales, Monmouthshire, Yorkshire, Cornwall, Cheshire, Lancashire, Derbyshire, Northumberland, Nottinghamshire, and Bedfordshire*; in all of which counties their sittings exceed in number those provided by the Church of England; while in *Wales and Monmouthshire* they are more than double. In all the other counties the Establishment has a preponderance,—most conspicuous in *Herefordshire, Sussex, and Oxfordshire*, where the sittings of the church are more than double those of the dissenters. The two parties are very nearly balanced in *Lincolnshire, Staffordshire, Leicestershire, Cumberland, and Cambridgeshire*. On the whole of England and Wales, for every 100 sittings provided by the Church of England, dissenters furnish 93.’—Report, p. cxi.

The Church of England has increased her provision by 24 per cent. in the last half century; yet the population having, in the same time, increased 101·6 per cent., she now provides for only 29·6 per cent.; whereas, her provision in 1801 was 48·2 per cent.,—the difference being a proportion of nearly 19 per cent. *less* than it was fifty years ago; but within the last ten years the increase of church ‘provision has been gaining fastly on the increase of the population,—an increase in the rate of progress which, on the whole, is not unsatisfactory, but inadequate to the rapidly

growing wants of towns.' Of the chief Protestant dissenting bodies we are told that

'The WESLEYAN METHODISTS are found in greatest force in Cornwall, Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Derbyshire, Durham, and Nottinghamshire; their fewest numbers are in Middlesex, Surrey, Sussex, Essex, Warwickshire, and Hertfordshire. The INDEPENDENTS flourish most in South Wales, North Wales, Essex, Dorsetshire, Monmouthshire, and Suffolk; least in Northumberland, Durham, Herefordshire, and Worcestershire. The BAPTISTS are strongest in Monmouthshire, South Wales, Huntingdonshire, Bedfordshire, Northamptonshire, Leicestershire, and Buckinghamshire; weakest in Cumberland, Northumberland, Westmoreland, Cornwall, Staffordshire, and Lancashire.'—p. cxliv.

The rate of increase in these three denominations, respectively, through the whole of England and Wales is represented thus:—

TABLE 17.

PERIODS.	WESLEYAN METHODISTS. (All Branches.)			INDEPENDENTS.			BAPTISTS. (All Branches.)		
	Number of Places of Worship and Sitzings at each Period.		Rate of Increase per cent. at each Period.	Number of Places of Worship and Sitzings at each Period.		Rate of Increase per cent. at each Period.	Number of Places of Worship and Sitzings at each Period.		Rate of Increase per cent. at each Period.
	Places of Worship.	Sittings.		Places of Worship.	Sittings.		Places of Worship.	Sittings.	
1801	825	165,000	—	914	299,792	—	652	176,692	—
1811	1,485	296,000	80·0	1140	373,920	24·7	858	232,518	31·6
1821	2,748	549,600	85·0	1478	484,784	29·2	1170	317,070	36·4
1831	4,622	924,400	68·2	1999	655,672	35·2	1613	437,123	37·9
1841	7,819	1,563,800	69·2	2606	854,768	30·4	2174	589,154	34·7
1851	11,007	2,194,298	40·3	3244	1,067,760	24·9	2789	752,343	27·7

'From this it appears that neither of these bodies is advancing at a rate so rapid as formerly. But then it must also be remembered, that neither is there room for such a rapid increase, since the aggregate rate of increase during the half century has been so much more rapid than the increase of the population that whereas, in 1801, the number of sittings provided for every 1000 persons was—by Wesleyans 18, by Independents 34, and by Baptists 20; in 1851, the provision was—by Wesleyans 123, by Independents 59, and by Baptists 42.'

Taking all the protestant dissenting communities together, it appears that they 'provide accommodation for 4,657,422 persons, or for 26 per cent. of the population, and 5·6 per cent. of the aggregate provision of the country. The proportion of this accommodation, which is available at each period of the day is—morning, 3,428,665 sittings; afternoon, 2,367,379 sittings; evening, 3,855,394 sittings; making a total, at all three portions of the day, of 9,651,438 sittings.'

The returns from the *Roman Catholics* show 570 places of worship, containing 186,111 sittings, with an intimation, however, that large numbers are accommodated standing, of whom

return is given in the abstracts, though in another table the number of attendants is given, not at 186,111, but at 305,393.

'The rate at which the Roman Catholics have increased in the last half century will be best seen by reference to the statistics from the period since 1824, given *ante*, page ci., instead of relying upon the doubtful indication supplied by the dates at which existing edifices were erected. From this source it appears that in 1824 there were 346 Roman-catholic chapels in England and Wales, while in 1853 the number had increased to 616. If we assume that the proportion of sittings to a chapel was the same (314) at each of these periods as in 1851, the number in 1824 would be 108,644, and the number in 1853 would be 193,424; the rate of increase in the thirty years being 87·2 per cent. During very nearly the same interval (*viz.*, from 1821 to 1851), the sittings of all Protestant bodies, unitedly increased from 5,985,842 to 9,982,533, the rate being 66·8 per cent. For every 1000 of the population, the Roman Catholics provided 8 sittings in 1824, 10 sittings in 1853. The Protestants provided for every 1000 persons, 499 sittings in 1821, and 557 sittings in 1851. The proportion of sittings belonging to Roman Catholics to those belonging to Protestants was 1·8 to 100, at the former period, and 1·9 to 100 at the latter.'—pp. cxlvii., cxlviii.

The result of Mr. Mann's calculations, founded on *all* the returns, is—that there is wanted an additional supply of 1,644,734 sittings in the large town districts, and especially in London. These would require the erection of at least *two thousand large places of worship*. Of the accommodation now existing,—

5,317,915, are provided by the Church of England;
4,894,648, by other churches;

10,212,563, total provision made;
1,644,734, to be supplied;

11,857,297, the provision required.

The history of the past twenty years inspires encouragement for the future. The proportion of the sittings has risen from 50 per cent. of the population to 57 per cent. Several societies, of a missionary character, are spending about thirty thousand pounds a-year on this object. Additional services might probably be conducted in most of the churches and chapels in large towns. Public buildings may be used almost indefinitely for such as have any dislike to churches and chapels. But, supposing adequate accommodation provided for all who may attend some place of public worship if they will, *what reason have we to expect that the accommodation would be used?* In point of fact, less than half of the accommodation now provided is habitually used. 'It is tolerably certain that the 5,288,294 who every

Sunday neglect religious ordinances, *do so of their own free choice*, and are not compelled to be absent on account of a deficiency of sittings.'

'The most important fact which this investigation as to attendance brings before us is unquestionably the alarming number of the non-attendants. Even in the least unfavourable aspect of the figures just presented, and assuming (as no doubt is right) that the 5,288,294 absent every Sunday are not always the same individuals, it must be apparent that *a sadly formidable portion of the English people are habitual neglecters of the public ordinances of religion*. Nor is it difficult to indicate to what particular class of the community this portion in the main belongs. The middle classes have augmented rather than diminished that devotional sentiment and strictness of attention to religious services by which for several centuries they have so eminently been distinguished. With the upper classes, too, the subject of religion has obtained of late a marked degree of notice, and a regular church attendance is now ranked among the recognised proprieties of life. It is to satisfy the wants of these two classes that the number of religious structures has of late years so increased. But while the *labouring* myriads of our country have been multiplying with our multiplied material prosperity, it cannot, it is feared, be stated that a corresponding increase has occurred in the attendance of this class at our religious edifices. More especially in cities and large towns it is observable how absolutely insignificant a portion of the congregations is composed of artisans. They fill, perhaps, in youth, our National, British, and Sunday schools, and there receive the elements of religious education; but, no sooner do they mingle in the active world of labour than, subjected to the constant action of opposing influences, they soon become as utter strangers to religious ordinances as the people of a heathen country. From whatever cause, in them or in the manner of their treatment by religious bodies, it is sadly certain that this vast, intelligent, and growingly important section of our countrymen are thoroughly estranged from our religious institutions in their present aspect. Probably, indeed, the prevalence of infidelity has been exaggerated, if the word be taken in its popular meaning, as implying some degree of intellectual effort and decision; but no doubt a great extent of negative, inert indifference prevails, the practical effects of which are much the same. There is a sect, originated recently, adherents to a system called "Secularism:" the principal tenet being that, as the fact of a future life is (in their view) at all events susceptible of *some* degree of doubt, while the fact and the necessities of a present life are matters of direct sensation, it is therefore prudent to attend exclusively to the concerns of that existence which is certain and immediate—not wasting energies required for present duties by a preparation for remote and merely possible contingencies. This is the creed which probably with most exactness indicates the faith which virtually, though not professedly, is entertained by the masses of our working population; by the skilled and unskilled labourer alike; by hosts of minor shopkeepers and Sunday traders; and by miserable denizens of

courts and crowded alleys. They are *unconscious secularists*—engrossed by the demands, the trials, or the pleasures of the passing hour, and ignorant or careless of a future. They are never or but seldom seen in our religious congregations; and the melancholy fact is thus impressed upon our notice that *the classes which are most in need of the restraints and consolations of religion are the classes which are most without them.*—p. clviii.

The dislike so manifestly shown by our labouring population to religious associations is ascribed chiefly to the obtrusion of social distinctions on their notice in the forms and arrangements; to the want of sympathy with their sufferings on the part of professed Christians; to the misconceptions cherished by working men regarding the motives of Christian ministers; and to the poverty, with all the accompaniments of filth and vice, of their condition. Each of these hinderances to attendance on public worship is one which we are not without the means of removing, if we go wisely and heartily to work; and some of these are attended to in the Report.

For the filling of the places already built, or in course of being built, Mr. Mann dwells on the necessity of augmented agencies for acting aggressively upon the irreligious portions of the community. The people are not inaccessible. They *are* reached in large numbers. Various schemes are even now in operation for familiar intercourse with them on the part of judicious and kind teachers. Much will be done by the sub-division of parishes, and much more might be done by missions unrestricted by parochial notions. More liberal ideas of what is meant by *preaching* will have to be diffused among churchmen, and not much less among dissenters. The extension of the episcopate and the removal of suffragan bishops would contribute largely, we doubt not, to the efficiency of the Church of England. The ‘prominent facts elicited by the whole inquiry’ are summed up by Mr. Mann in the following brief statement:—

‘The great facts which appear to me to have been elicited by this inquiry are, that, even taking the accommodation provided by all the sects, including the most extravagant unitedly, there are 1,644,734 inhabitants of England who, if all who might attend religious services were willing to attend, would not be able, on account of insufficient room, to join in public worship; that this deficiency prevails almost exclusively in *towns*, especially *large towns*; that if these 1,644,734 persons are to be deprived of all excuse for non-attendance, there must be at least as many additional sittings furnished, equal to about 2000 churches and chapels, and a certain number more if any of the present provisions be regarded as of doubtful value; and that even such additional accommodation will fall short of the requirement if the edifices are so often, as at present, closed. Further, it appears that as many as 5,288,294 persons able to attend are every Sunday absent from

religious services, for all of whom there is accommodation for at least one service; that neglect like this, in spite of opportunities for worship, indicates the insufficiency of any mere addition to the number of religious *buildings*; that the greatest difficulty is to fill the churches when provided; and that this can only be accomplished by a great addition to the number of efficient, earnest, religious *teachers*, clerical or lay, by whose persuasions the reluctant population might be won.'—p. clxvii.

In examining these valuable Tables, and the judicious Report based upon them, we find some truths of great practical interest elucidated in a most satisfactory manner.

We are living in a country which possesses a larger amount of personal and civil freedom than any other in the world. Our freedom has been won for us by our religion, by the manliness it produces—the confidence it inspires—the harmonious action it secures—and the deep regard for humanity which it breathes through the heart of the people. We cannot but be thankful for the large exhibition afforded by these tables of the religious character of the nation, at once insuring freedom, guarding it against the excesses of riot and insurrection from below, and against the oppressions of tyranny from above.

Notwithstanding the prodigious increase of population during the last half century, the progress of provision for public worship among ourselves, of education for the children of the poor, of institutions for the sick and helpless, and of societies for spreading the Gospel among heathen nations, has been greater.

While the number of national churches built during the last fifty years is 2529, at a cost of £9,087,000, to which the public funds have contributed £1,693,429—leaving the large sum of seven millions, four hundred and twenty-three thousand, five hundred and seventy-one pounds to be raised by private benefactions. Not only have these vast benefactions been provided by the spontaneous gifts of members of the Church of England: they have raised a hundred and fifty thousand a year for the support of special organizations for the spiritual benefit of our home population, besides £250,000 bestowed on foreign missions, and a large porportion of support to institutions, such as the Bible Society and the Religious Tract Society, sustained by several denominations. It is to us, dissenters as we are, a matter for unfeigned joy, that the grand vital principles of Christianity are so active and fruitful in a church which many of its members imagine to be supported by the state, and which, we do most conscientiously believe, will be all that her best friends could wish her to be, when she relies entirely upon her rich resources, without any compulsory powers from the state.

In comparing the Church of England with the non-established

churches, we observe that out of 34,467 places of worship in England and Wales, the Church of England has 14,077—the other churches have 20,290; of 9,467,738 sittings, the Church of England has 5,317,915—the other churches have 4,894,648. If we separate Wales, including Monmouth,

The dissenters have 2498 places, with 602,877 sittings.

'The church' . . . 947 264,548

Leaving a balance of 1519 338,329 in favour of dissenters.

Again, comparing 'the church' and dissenters in Lancashire, the returns give—

For dissenters . . . 1150 places, with 423,789 sittings.

For 'the church' . . . 529 389,546

Balance for dissenters . 621 34,243

Once more, comparing 'the church' with dissenters in Yorkshire, the returns give—

For dissenters . . . 2466 places, with 626,617 sittings.

For 'the church' . . . 1143 457,594

Balance for dissenters . 1323 places, with 169,023 sittings.

Further, the attendants on public worship on the 30th March, 1851, in Wales, were—

	Morning.	Afternoon.	Evening.
At dissenting chapels . . .	247,394	134,835	324,859
At churches	85,089	40,525	31,454
Balance for dissenters . . .	162,305	94,310	295,405

In Yorkshire—

	Morning.	Afternoon.	Evening.
At dissenting chapels . . .	220,977	185,992	215,740
At churches	168,712	120,751	53,280
Balance for dissenters . . .	52,265	65,241	162,460

The calculations made in these returns are confessedly incomplete; still they are sufficient to bring out the broad facts:—(1) That a large proportion of accommodation for religious worship provided by the Church of England is so unequally distributed as to be *practically of no value*; (2) that the increase of church accommodation in large towns is very rapid; (3) that the dissenters turn their places to *more account* than churchmen do; (4) that the spirit of dissent is gaining ground in our larger populations; and (5) that, after all the efforts of all churches

there remains a mass of one third of the population that does not publicly worship God at all.

In writing, mainly, for Protestant dissenters, we are anxious to offer to them a few simple practical suggestions, grounded on the Report we have been examining.

It ought to excite special thankfulness that the Christian principle of *uncompelled religion*, and *uncompelled* support of its institutions, receives so strong a testimony on its behalf in these Returns. Out of 2529 churches built during the first half of the present century, at a cost of upwards of nine millions of money, it appears that during the earlier thirty years the number built was not more than 500, to which the sum of one million, one hundred and fifty-two thousand and forty-four pounds were granted from the public funds; while in the later twenty years—*only one-third of the time*—six millions and eighty-seven thousand pounds were spent on two thousand and twenty-nine churches—*more than five times as many churches*—to which the state contributed only five hundred and eleven thousand, three hundred and eighty-five pounds:—the voluntary subscriptions in the *thirty years* amounting to one million, eight hundred and forty-seven thousand, nine hundred and fifty-six pounds; but, in the twenty years, to five millions, five hundred and seventy-five thousand, six hundred and fifteen pounds. We have no Table of the increase in the number of other Protestant communities; but we gather from the Report that there existed in 1851 twenty thousand, three hundred and ninety places of public worship, all built on the same principle, and most of them within the same half century, at a cost which we have no means of estimating, but probably not less than TEN MILLIONS.

While the active power of freedom is thus so manifest in the religious as well as in the social and commercial and political life of the nation, we are to remember that this freedom has been somewhat checked by the existence of a church established by law, endowed by the state, and clothed with a large amount of public authority, and aristocratic and traditional preferences securing on its behalf nearly all the rank, and a great preponderance of the wealth, of the nation. Notwithstanding the *prestige*, however, enjoyed by the Church of England, we learn from the Table marked 'K—The Comparative Position of the Church of England and the Dissenting Churches in different parts of the Country'—that in the counties of England and Wales the sittings provided by the Church of England is for 27·6 per cent. of the population, while the dissenters provide for 28·4 of the population; whereas in 46 of the great towns the church provides 47·8 per cent., and the dissenters provide 52·2 per cent. of the sittings. If we take the *counties* separately, we find a large preponderance of

dissenters in Bedford, Chester, Cornwall, Derby, Durham, Lancaster, Monmouth, Northumberland, Nottingham, the East, North, and West Ridings of York, North Wales, and South Wales: in the remaining counties there is a great preponderance of church accommodation, of which, it should be remarked, that being in the rural districts, one-third are open only once on a Sunday, and then but thinly attended. If we take the towns separately, we find a large preponderance of dissenters in *thirty-four* towns—Ashton-under-Lyne, Birmingham, Blackburn, Bolton, Bradford, Bristol, Bury, Derby, Devonport, Dudley, Great Yarmouth, Halifax, Huddersfield, Hull, Leeds, Leicester, Macclesfield, Manchester, Merthyr-Tydfil, Newcastle, Nottingham, Oldham, Plymouth, Portsmouth, Preston, Rochdale, Salford, Sheffield, Stockport, Stoke-upon-Trent, Sunderland, Swansea, Wigan, Wolverhampton; while we find a preponderance of church accommodation in *eleven* towns—Bath, Brighton, Cheltenham, Coventry, Exeter, Ipswich, Liverpool, LONDON, Norwich, Southampton, Worcester.

From another Table ('M. Comparative View of the Frequency with which the various Religious Bodies make use of the accommodation provided for by them respectively') we learn that in the Church of England it is 33·2 per cent.; in the other religious denominations it is 35·6 per cent. And from Table 'N, Number of Persons present at the most numerous attended Service on Sunday, March 30th, 1853,' we learn that, of the entire number, 6,356,222 there were—

3,110,782 Protestant Dissenters.

249,389 Roman Catholics.

24,793 Other Bodies.

3,384,964 Total Nonconformist.

2,971,258 Church of England.

413,706 Balance of Nonconformists.

While these comparisons bring out the relative strength of the several religious bodies of England and Wales, it ought not to be forgotten that Scotland and Ireland are not included in the Census, and that the state of *Great Britain and Ireland* is not yet before us. Doubtless there *was* a time when the Episcopal Community, styled the Church of England, was the church of the greater part of the nation; but that is so far from being the case now, that more than half of the nation is untaught by the clergy of that community, and has no share in whatever benefits are supposed to be enjoyed by its members. The *majority* of the nation is living in an *excommunicated* condition. We have been lately studying the 'Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical,

treated upon by the Bishop of London, President of the Convocation for the Province of Canterbury, and the rest of the Bishops and Clergy of the said Province, and agreed upon, with the king's Majesty's License, in their synod begun at London A.D. 1603, and now published, for the due observation of them, by his Majesty's authority under the great seal of England.' In these 'Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical,' we find the following description of persons are excommunicated, *ipso facto*:—

'Those who affirm that the Church of England by law established under the King's Majesty is not a true and apostolic church, teaching and maintaining the doctrine of the apostles;—those who affirm that the book of Common Prayer containeth anything in it that is repugnant to the Scriptures;—those who affirm that the Articles are in any part erroneous or superstitious, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto;—those who impugn as unscriptural the government of the church by archbishops, bishops, deans, arch-deacons;—combine themselves in a new *brotherhood*;—and all who affirm that churches, not held and allowed by the law of the land, may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches.'

These 'Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical' are regularly published, along with the Homilies and Articles, by the Prayer Book and Homily Society. We are not quite sure how far Mr. Mann is right in saying 'the Canons of 1603, contain, *so far as the clergy are concerned*, her code of discipline.' (Report p. xxxiii.) We presume that the Toleration Act, and other acts of parliament of a similar description, overrule the Canons Ecclesiastical.

We would not have it forgotten by whom these glorious liberties have been won, and at what cost. We think of Leighton and Bunyan, and thousands who suffered loss, imprisonment, and death, for doing what the *majority of the nation now do under the protection of British law*, and we can fancy the delight with which they would hail a report like this, and feel that they had not suffered nor died in vain. We do think that it is well for us to refresh our hearts with the remembrance of the men who sowed in tears what we now reap in joy.

The broad facts exhibited by these returns are of the most profound, sublime, and animating character. These arithmetical calculations and statistical tables are not, in themselves, attractive to the greater part even of our reading population; but men can be easily made to understand that these masses of figures represent the thoughts, the tears, the struggles, the prayers, the deaths, and the undying testimonials of more men and women than we can count; they display the fruits of ages of sorrow; they bring before us stately temples and lowly chapels, the lovely villages of England's plains and valleys, the stirring crowds of her busy towns, the labours of her many thousand pastors and teachers,

the quiet homes, the stillness of Sabbath, the glow of worship, the wisdom of teaching, the moving of millions of minds and hearts—the *grand weekly impulse* that makes England such a hive of industry, such a mart of commerce, such a queen among the nations of the free. ‘That Sabbath was a high day,’ on which, without constraint or bribery, the millions of our people rallied around the standards of their fathers, or those which their own hands had planted. To have seen them all, native and foreigner, Romanist and Protestant, the priest in gorgeous robe or plain surplice, the varied orders of dissenters dressed as at other times, all doing the same thing, each in his own way,—none to make them afraid,—none, we hope, even wishing that they could! Surely the banner of England never waved so royally on battle field, on tournament, on the mountain wave, or on the palace tower, as it fluttered in the air of freedom for the defence of these worshipping millions. And such a day as that comes once a week, bringing over many weary workers an earthly heaven. The hammer and the axe, the loom and the saw, the dark mine and the furrowed field, the busy street and shop, and wharf and counting-house and factory, are laid aside, and men are put in mind of God’s love to them; their hearts are raised to heaven and sweetened with piety, made soft for tender duties, strengthened with bravery for life’s battle; they drink of the waters that flow from a fountain far above them, and renew their covenants of love, and faith, and honour.

Not that we are willing to sink the peculiarities of our own faith in the vague satisfaction with which one sees the millions of our countrymen professedly engaged so sublimely and so blessedly as they are on every Sunday in the year. We do not look with satisfaction on something like one-third of the population of England committed to the spiritual charge of the Church of England. For, though we cheerfully admit that large numbers of the clergy of that Church are enlightened and faithful men, what proportion of them may bear this character we have not the means of ascertaining. At the same time, when we consider the class of persons from whom the clergy come, the preparatory training they undergo, the motives, *other than religious*, which draw them to this profession, the great amount of merely formal ceremonies in which their duties consist, and, more than all, the illiberal tendencies exhibited by so many of them, we cannot look without painful concern at the cold formalism and degrading superstition which so largely pervade their ministrations.

We hold it to be the duty of nonconformists to be perpetually urging on the general public mind, not only in towns, but throughout the country, their strong objections to a state of things which presents so much the appearance of religious worship with so

little of intelligent belief, manly judgment, evangelical soundness, and spiritual character. Let evangelical dissenters take their stand on the facts embodied in this Report, and earnestly exert themselves to remove from a system which they conscientiously disapprove all the sanction which, in the name of the whole nation, it receives from the public authority of the State. While the 'Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage and Control' labours, as we trust it will, with increasing co-operation from both religious and political parties, to secure the abrogation of all laws which give the Church of England an ascendancy which is *not* religious, but secular, based not on reason and equity, but in ancient usage and interested prejudice, let those who believe, as we do, in the personal and spiritual nature of religion, put on new strength and purpose in exposing the evils existing *in the Church itself*, as a church, apart from the consideration of its thralldom and subserviency to the ruling powers of the day. Let them denounce the unscriptural usurpations of its prelacy, its priesthood, its sacraments, and its superstitions, by diffusing among the people, with the earnestness which is calm, wise, active, patient, and hopeful, those simple principles which are revealed in the Gospel, and which speak plainly to the moral judgments and the religious susceptibilities of Englishmen. It is our opinion that this can be done without hostility to any man: if not, still let it be done; for truth and conscience ought to rule the people.

While we look with dissatisfaction on the Church of England, let it not be supposed that we have any fondness for dissent. We accept the term merely as a conventional distinction, having only a relative significance: let there be no Establishment and there can be no dissent. The most ultra dissenters are they who believe *nothing* which the Church of England believes, and do *nothing* which the Church of England does; while those who bear the name, the dissenters of England, are men who professedly make a conscience of matters which they believe to be neglected in the beliefs and in the practices of the Church established by law. Why should they, by *law*, be compelled to support the structures and the officials of a Church from which the law does not prohibit their secession? Why are their sons excluded from the great public seminaries, and the ancient universities, and the children of their poor from the national schools? Why should they be marked as less loyal, less respectable, less worthy of any position for which they are intellectually and morally fit, than the millions who have but to profess adherence to 'the Church'? Reason there is none for all this: much reason, indeed, for the contrary. Surely, then, there ought to be no hesitation, no inactivity among the protestant dissenters of England in pressing on their fellow-countrymen the sacred

claims of their own freedom, and of the principles which give to that freedom its dignity and its value. There are twenty thousand protestant dissenting congregations in England and Wales, to say nothing now of Scotland or Ireland, who *could* join in vigorous measures for exhibiting to the country in a powerful and striking protest against what they, all alike, believe to be the faults of the old feudal system, from which they severally dissent. We are quite aware that the doing of what we recommend would provoke controversy. And who is afraid of controversy? Were not slaveholders afraid of it? Were not the monopolists of bread afraid of it? Are not the holders of ancient errors, the serfs of unexamined prejudices, afraid of it? Truth, principle, earnestness, conscience, benevolence, have no fear; and they who profess them are bound to show that they do not shun the most keen and sifting examination of those convictions.

We must say a little of the position of the Roman Catholics in these returns. In 1824 there were 346 chapels in England and Wales: in 1853 the number had increased to 616. There are now 11 colleges, and 88 religious houses—15 for men, 73 for women; and the number of priests is 875. 'The number of attendants on the Census-Sunday (making an estimated addition for 27 chapels, the returns of which were silent on this point) was: morning, 252,783; afternoon, 53,967; evening, 76,880. It will be observed that in the morning the number of attendants was more than the number of sittings. This is explained by the fact that in many Roman-catholic chapels there is more than one morning service, attended by different individuals.' It appears on this showing, that, though the increase is considerable, arising entirely, we believe, from the increased facilities for immigration from Ireland, and though the tendencies towards Romanism have been strongly marked in both the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, there is nothing like the general aggrandizement of popery, about which so much alarm has frequently been expressed by Protestants, and so many boasts have been uttered by papists. In the counties of Huntingdon and Rutland no place of worship for Roman Catholics is returned; in Bedfordshire 1; in Westmoreland 2; in Cambridgeshire 3; in Hertfordshire 4; in Herefordshire 5; in Nottingham 5; the largest number, 114, is in Lancashire. The number of sittings is one in a hundred of the entire population—a smaller number than that of the Calvinist Methodists, one-fourth of the number provided for by Baptists,—one-sixth of the number provided by Independents—one-twelfth of the Wesleyan Methodists,—and less than one twenty-ninth of the Church of England. In Lancashire, where they most abound, they provide sittings for rather more than two per cent. of a population amounting to 2,067,301; while, in the same county,

the Church of England provides sittings for more than nineteen per cent., and other protestant churches provide for more than seventeen per cent. In London they return no places for St. Luke; East London; West London; Shoreditch; Bethnal Green; St. Saviour, Southwark; Newington; Lambeth; Camberwell; Rotherhithe; or Lewisham;—while their largest congregations are in Kensington; Marylebone; St. Pancras; City of London; Bermondsey; Greenwich; and the largest of all in St. George's, Southwark.

One of the most astounding particulars in this Report relates to the 'Latter-day Saints, or Mormonites,' of whose history we have given a detailed account in a former number. They now occupy in England 222 places of worship, in which are 22,555 free sittings, and in which were 35,326 attendances on the Census-Sunday.—Of these there were 1685 in London; 223 in the south-eastern counties; 942 in the south-midland counties; 635 in the eastern counties; 1235 in the south-western counties; 2645 in the west-midland counties; 1961 in the north-midland counties; 1969 in the north-western counties; 1053 in Yorkshire; 192 in the northern counties; 2739 in the Welsh counties. We have none in Cornwall, Westmoreland, or the North-Riding of Yorkshire; but they are more or less spread over nearly the entire country. Of many of the following congregations we never heard before:—Orthodox Christians, New Christians, Primitive Christians, New Testament Christians, Original Christians, United Christians, Gospel Pilgrims, Free Gospel Christians, Believers, Gospel Refugees, Free Thinking Christians, Teetotalers, Benevolent Methodists, Israelites, Christian Israelites, Temperance Wesleyans, Temperance Christians, Free-thinkers, Rational Progressionists; and we did not expect that in 1851 there would still be four congregations of *Southcottians*.

The most oppressive question suggested by the Report is that which we have often pondered—*How are the working men who do not attend our places of worship to be reached by the Gospel?* We cannot think of doing more than advert to it now that we have reached our limits. It deserves a separate discussion, on which we propose to enter with as little delay as possible in an early future number of this journal.

Brief Notices.

CONTENTS.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. i. The Russians of the South.—ii. Indications of Instinct.—iii. Adventures in the Wilds of North America.
2. Memoirs of an ex-Capuchin; or, Scenes of Modern Monastic Life.
3. Twelve Years a Slave.
4. A Spring in the Canterbury Settlement. | 5. i. Poetical Works of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. Minor Contemporaneous Poets, and Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst.—ii. Poetical Works of John Dryden.
6. The Land of the Forum and the Vatican.
7. Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay.
8. Hours of Christian Devotion. |
|--|---|

1. *The Russians of the South.* By Shirley Brooks. pp. 147.
2. *Indications of Instinct.* By T. Lindley Kemp, M.D. pp. 144.
3. *Adventures in the Wilds of North America.* By Charles Lanman. Edited by Charles Richard Weld. Parts I. and II. pp. 300. London: Longman and Co.

THESE publications belong to the 'Traveller's Library,' of which they form Parts 53-56 inclusive. Each has a character of its own, and will be read with much pleasure by a large class. 'The Russians of the South' is one of the best books we have read on the Southern provinces of the Czar. Within narrow limits, and at a very small cost, it supplies a large mass of facts illustrative of the social condition, and commercial prospects, of a people of whom we have hitherto known so little. Mr. Brooks is a keen observer, an industrious collector of facts, and a very pleasing narrator of the incidents noticed. There is a pleasantry in his style which keeps attention alive, while his words bespeak a truthfulness which insures respect and confidence. In common with all other well-informed witnesses, he bears strong testimony to the universal corruption of Russian officials, and the wretched condition of the great mass of the people.

Dr. Kemp's 'Indications of Instinct' is designed 'to present to the traveller a little popular scientific reading, which, it is hoped, may be interesting.' It is slight praise to say that it answers its purpose. The instincts of plants, of animals lower than insects, of insects themselves, of fishes and reptiles, of birds and of mammals, with the reasoning powers of the higher animals and the instinctive beliefs of man, are illustrated in the course of eight chapters, in a style of intimate familiarity and of great interest. We have read the work with very considerable pleasure, and cordially recommend it as suited to enlarge the field of knowledge, and to deepen the impression of an all-pervading intelligence.

Mr. Lanman's 'Adventures' is a work of a different character from either of these. Relinquishing a mercantile career in New York, the

author started, some years since, 'for the Western States, more intent on pleasure than fortune making.' The narrative of his wanderings, was in part communicated to the American public, through the medium of their periodical press, and elicited warm commendation from some of the best writers of that country. 'I am glad,' said Washington Irving, addressing Mr. Lanman, 'that you intend to publish your narrative and descriptive writings in a collected form. They carry us into fastnesses of our mountains, the depths of our forests, the watery wilderness of our lakes and rivers; giving us pictures of savage life and savage tribes, Indian legends, fishing and hunting anecdotes, the adventures of trappers and backwoodsmen, our whole arcanum, in short, of indigenous poetry and romance.' This is high praise, and it is merited. We need not add anything to *such* commendation, and shall therefore content ourselves—in the language of the editor—with introducing 'Mr. Lanman to the English reader, feeling confident that he will be found an interesting and instructive companion.'

Memoirs of an ex-Capuchin; or, Scenes of Modern Monastic Life.
By Girolamo Volpi, a Converted Priest. London: Partridge and Oakey.

M. VOLPI has rendered an acceptable service by the publication of this small volume, which details the history of the monastic life of his friend, M. Crespi. Few of our readers are probably prepared for the disclosures which are made. Until recently popery, with us, has been a thing of the past rather than of the present; a matter of controversy more than one of fact. In our ignorance of its internal working, we have imagined that it had shared in the general progress of thought and feeling. We fear, however, that such a notion must be abandoned. It is with reluctance that we admit this conclusion, but the revelations recently afforded leave us no alternative. The present volume wears every appearance of authenticity, is free from the bitterness which has characterized some productions, and is sustained, in its general outline, by the best authorities we can consult. Our readers will do well to give it an attentive perusal, and if they are astonished at some of its disclosures, they will also be grateful to an overruling Providence for having exempted them from the delusions which are fraught with such present misery, and entail such a dearth of well-grounded Christian hope.

Twelve Years a Slave. Narrative of Solomon Northup, a citizen of New York, kidnapped in Washington City in 1841, and rescued in 1853, from a Cotton Plantation near the Red River, in Louisiana. 12mo, pp. 336. London: Sampson Low and Co.

ANOTHER harrowing tale of American slavery, which confirms too exactly the worst reports of other witnesses. In one respect the narrative differs from many recently imported. Solomon Northup was not born a slave, but, like multitudes of free coloured men, was foully

kidnapped, and for twelve years was doomed to the wretchedness and manifold wrongs of negro bondage. Such a circumstance is not of unfrequent occurrence in the States. There is reason to suppose that large numbers are thus deprived of the right which even American laws cede to this ill-fated race. It will ever be so while slavery lasts. Bad men will avail themselves of the system to advantage their pecuniary interest, and opportunities for doing so will frequently occur. It is in vain for the slaveholder to denounce the negro stealer. The receiver of stolen goods is, in many cases, more criminal than the thief. If the vocation of the latter is to be stopped, we must close the houses of the former. The indignant terms in which southern advocates sometimes denounce the kidnapper are nothing more than words. It is a poor, hypocritical philanthropy, of which they boast. The thing is seen through and despised by all true-hearted men. The volume before us goes far to prove this, and it should be read and pondered over by all who are desirous of tracing the actual working of the slave system. 'My object,' says Solomon Northup, 'is to give a candid and truthful statement of facts: to repeat the story of my life without exaggeration, leaving it for others to determine whether even the pages of fiction present a picture of more cruel wrong or a severer bondage.' The 'Narrative' bears abundant marks of authenticity, and will serve to deepen, if that be possible, our abhorrence of the system which constitutes the opprobrium and the curse of the American republic.

A Spring in the Canterbury Settlement. By C. Warren Adams, Esq. With Engravings. 12mo. London: Longman and Co.

MR. ADAMS has turned a fit of sickness to a good purpose. His medical adviser having recommended 'a long sea voyage, and a bracing climate,' he went to New Zealand and back, and, to judge from the vigour with which he tells his story, the prescription answered well. He visited only the *Canterbury Settlement*; and it is to be regretted that his statements confirm some reports of its managers having been imprudent in placing the price of £3 per acre on the lands. The consideration for this enormous sum was to be the performance of public works, *which are still to be done by the Association*, and which colonists would always do best themselves.

Mr. Adams speaks favourably of the country; and the settlers go on well with the natives, whose evident capability of civilization is here putting our humane policy to a severe test. It is satisfactory to add that, although the difficulties of their new life alarmed the large party of emigrants whom Mr. Adams accompanied to New Zealand, yet their perseverance was rewarded; and 'when he left the colony, they were all comfortably settled, and doing well.' It is understood that the eminent men, Lord Lyttelton and his colleagues, who, in a warm spirit of colonial enterprize, founded the Canterbury Settlement, have determined to meet the pecuniary difficulties which arise out of mere miscalculation, in a way to do themselves great credit, and, as there is reason to expect, without ultimate loss to the actual settlers.

1. *Poetical Works of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. Minor Contemporaneous poets, and Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst.* Edited by Robert Bell.
2. *Poetical Works of John Dryden.* Edited by Robert Bell. Vol. II. London: John W. Parker and Son.

THESE volumes constitute the second and third of the 'Annotated Edition of the English Poets,' of which the first volume was noticed in our Journal for February last. The former of them is introduced by a brief sketch of the 'Life of Surrey,' including a general critique on his genius, which forms a welcome addition to the labors of previous editors. Few names amongst our early poets are so familiar as that of Surrey, yet little is known of his writings, nor is it perhaps too much to say that they never can be popular. 'The affecting incidents supposed to lie at the springs of his poetry, his brilliant reputation as a representative of English chivalry in the age of the Field of the Cloth of Gold, and the tragical close of his career in the prime of his life and powers, have invested his memory with a romantic interest.' Recent investigation has dissipated much of this romance; yet the name of Surrey is still cherished with fond admiration, and, in the popular faith, is regarded as a synonym for all the gallantry and accomplishment of his age. To his genius 'English poetry owes large obligations. . . . He founded a new era in versification, purified and strengthened our poetical diction, and, shunning the vices of his predecessors, set the example of a style in which, for the first time, verbal pedantry and fantastical devices were wholly ignored.' In his own age his productions were extensively popular, but his fame was speedily eclipsed by the resplendent genius of Shakespere and the other illustrious men who adorned the age of Elizabeth and James I. To all who are interested in the history of our literature and in the growth of our language, this volume will prove an acceptable present. It is edited with care, and its value is enhanced by the addition of the productions of several 'Minor Poets,' who were contemporaneous with the illustrious but ill-fated Surrey.

The other volume, forming the second of 'Dryden's Works,' contains amongst several other pieces, the 'Medal,' a political satire, in which the Earl of Shaftesbury is 'literally slaughtered piecemeal;' the 'Religio Laici,' wherein the supremacy of Scripture, as the sole rule of faith, is vindicated with rare felicity and force; and the 'Hind and the Panther,' in which, about four years afterwards, Dryden announced his conversion to popery, and under the machinery of a fable, sought to inflict a death blow on his former faith, and to establish the exclusive authority of the Church of Rome. The two latter productions present, so far as versification permits, and as the character of the writer allowed, the strength of the hostile creeds, and Mr. Bell has done good service by placing extracts from each in juxta-position. We thank him for the labor of selection, and need do no more than announce the publication of the volume.

The Land of the Forum and the Vatican; or, Thoughts and Sketches during an Easter Pilgrimage to Rome. By Newman Hall, B.A. pp. xv.—463. London: Nisbet. 1854.

To the reasons given by Mr. Hall in his preface for adding another to the many modern books of Italian travel, he might have truly added that every writer has his own class of readers, to whom the record of his experiences and impressions is sure to be interesting on personal grounds. His descriptions are always lively, his expressions of devout feeling appropriate, and his notices of works of art creditable alike to his intelligence and his good taste. The historical information will be acceptable, we doubt not, to the greater portion of his readers. The permanent worth of the volume is enhanced by his citations from former travellers, as well as from poets. But the disproportionate space occupied by minor details of no moment, and the long dissertations on theological topics, have made us regret that he should have been in such haste to print. We do not see the necessity for this. He would have done better had he allowed himself time for revision and curtailment. However important an event it may be in a man's life to visit Rome, even that does not preclude the propriety of taking due pains in the composition of a book intended for the public.

Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay, author of Evelina, Cecilia, &c. Edited by her Niece. A New Edition. Vol. I. London: Hurst and Blackett.

THE first volume of a cheap edition of a work which has strong claims on the confidence and admiration of our countrymen. Madame D'Arblay's 'Diary' throws much light on the court of George III., and thus serves to gratify the curious, at the same time that it explains some important public events. The author was highly esteemed by the most distinguished men of her day; and her productions, though now seldom read, occupy a marked and eminent place in the literary history of England. We are glad to see this reprint, and hope to hear of its extensive circulation. It is to consist of seven volumes, price three shillings each, and will furnish to the reader an ample supply of very interesting and not uninteresting matter.

Hours of Christian Devotion. Translated from the German of Dr. A. Tholuck. With a Preface, by the Rev. H. Bonar. pp. 256. London: James Nisbet and Co. 1853.

It has been often a matter of wonder to us, that the entire works of the illustrious German theologian and preacher, Dr. Tholuck, have not been rendered into our language; so that we hail this translation of one of his treatises with peculiar pleasure. There are but few really good devotional works. Of those already existing, many are either puerile or mawkish in their style, and, to a great extent, tend to encourage the dangerous sentiment, that the happiness of a religious

man is enjoyed separately from the endeavour to fulfil present duties. This admirable work of Dr. Tholuck presents healthy sentiments and correct explications of prominent scriptural truth. The present translation is well executed, evincing, not merely extensive, but exact acquaintance with the German language; and the rendering of many idioms, difficult to the student, is exceedingly chaste and happy. We have been peculiarly struck at the graceful manner in which the German poetry in the work has been rendered into English verse. To translate prose is comparatively easy; but to render poetry well into a language foreign from that in which it was originally written, preserving also the identity of metre, is that which an accomplished scholar only can achieve. In the present translation, however, the endeavour to do so has been successful. We venture to predict that this very neat and happily-executed little volume will become a favourite with devout and intelligent persons of all classes.

Review of the Month.

THE REFORM BILL IS POSTPONED FROM THE 30TH OF MARCH TO THE 27TH OF APRIL.—This is much what we expected, and we shall not be surprised if, when the latter day arrives, it is again deferred. The announcement was made by Lord John Russell on the 3rd; and his manner on the occasion—more particularly the tone of his reply to Sir J. Shelley—convinces us that it was an unpalatable task which he had to perform. His lordship is ordinarily cool and unimpassioned; it is rarely that his oratory exhibits much feeling, and hence it seldom stirs deeply the hearts of his hearers. On this occasion, however, he was greatly excited, and suffered himself to be provoked by the ungenerous taunts of the hon. member for Westminster. Each party, both Lord John and Sir John Shelley, ought to have borne in mind the circumstances of the other. Lord John should have realized the questionable position in which postponement placed him, and allowed, therefore, for the sensitive jealousy of his impugner; while Sir John Shelley ought surely to have remembered the difficulties of his lordship's position, and have abstained from the insinuations in which he so freely indulged. We deeply regret the fact of postponement, yet we sympathize with Mr. Hume's indignant protest against the course of Sir John Shelley. The position of the ministerial leader was embarrassed by the fact that he had so recently pleaded against postponement on account of the impending war. In doing so, however, he had probably calculated on large popular support; and as this was not forthcoming, as the public mind was evidently engrossed by the military preparations which are pro-

ceeding, he might honestly conclude that it was in vain to attempt to carry through his measure. Whatever may be thought of particular features of the ministerial bill, it is, as a whole, far too radical to be acceptable to the Upper House, or even to a large section of those who range under the denomination of 'liberals' in the lower one. Such a measure has no chance of success, unless public attention be riveted on it, and the force of popular support be unequivocally arrayed on its behalf. Now this is not the case. Whatever may be its cause, the fact itself is undoubted. Men are thinking on armies and fleets, are anticipating victory, and exulting over the expected humiliation of the Czar. Moreover, their material condition is too good to warrant the expectation of their bestirring themselves as in 1832; and some of those from whom better things were to be anticipated, have done their utmost to prevent popular enthusiasm, and to damage the credit of the government. We see, therefore, no probability of the measure being carried at the present moment, and are consequently disposed more contentedly to rest in its postponement. For the credit of the ministry, it would have been better had they contented themselves at first with sketching an outline of their measure. Had Lord John clearly stated the views of the Cabinet, and pledged it to their practical enforcement at the first eligible moment, instead of bringing in a substantive measure, he would have escaped the mortification of postponement, and have equally committed the statesmanship of the country to the principles of his bill. It is true that he could not foresee the want of popular support, and so far we admit a justifying plea. After all, the question of time is a very secondary one. A cabinet composed of the most moderate sections of Reformers—many of them known only as its opponents—are now committed to an extensive disfranchisement of small boroughs, to a large increase of the constituency, and to the admission to the franchise of several classes hitherto excluded. These are gains which infinitely outweigh the evil of postponement. Reform is no longer a doubtful matter. It will signify little, so far as this question is concerned, which party is in power. We shall soon have Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli bidding against their political opponents, and, at an earlier period than many imagine, may probably have a better measure than that which is now before us. Let the English people trust themselves, and they will yet triumph. Their own good sense and stern determination will accomplish their righteous purpose. Much may be gained by a further ventilation of the subject, and we counsel all who are interested in parliamentary reform to give attention to its details as well as its principles, that they may be prepared with energy, promptitude, and wisdom, to take advantage of the opportune occasions which will arise.

MR. J. CHAMBERS' MOTION RESPECTING CONVENTUAL AND MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS occupied the House of Commons on the 1st. Its direct object was the appointment of a committee to inquire whether any, and if any, what further legislation was called for by the present condition of these establishments. He showed that between the years 1843 and 1853, the number of catholic convents in England and Ireland had

increased from 56 in the former year to 220 in the latter,—17 out of the 220 being anglo-catholic establishments, which had risen into existence during that decade. This shows a multiplication of nearly four hundred per cent., or forty per cent. per annum. Mr. Chambers then adduced facts to show that females were immured in these houses, not only against the will of their parents, but against their own, and contended that these must be places of restraint and infliction which, in all ascetic systems of religion, were a recognised part of their discipline. He demanded the interposition of parliament to forbid, not spiritual, but physical tyranny; declaring that in these institutions there was not only a power to imprison and torture, but also, by means of affiliated societies abroad, to transport. The motion was opposed, though on different grounds, by Roman-catholic and protestant members. The former denied Mr. Chambers' facts, and denounced the proposal as an insult to their religion. Among the protestant opponents, we find Lord John Russell and the honorable member for Rochdale. His lordship declared that if he could believe that any cruelty was practised in convents, he should discard all feelings of delicacy; but he did not believe that Roman-catholic gentlemen would allow their daughters to be ill-used. At the same time, he most characteristically impressed upon the House the great constitutional principle, that they should not give way to the feeling out of doors. Mr. Miall opposed the motion on two grounds of a somewhat extraordinary kind. The first was, that no facts had been adduced to constitute a *prima facie* case for inquiry. But we imagine that the *prima facie* ground is sufficiently established by the very circumstances of the case, coupled with the known tendencies of human nature generally, and of the *genus* priest in particular. So long as there is a passion in the human heart which is gratified by the exercise of spiritual power, and so long as that passion can be gratified on the enthusiastic or the helpless, conventual institutions must present fair objects for magisterial surveillance; while the difficulty of obtaining conclusive evidence as to facts furnishes of itself the strongest motive for inquiry. Establishments so barred and shrouded as to preclude every ray of evidence touching the condition, the treatment, the practices, and the sufferings of their inmates, are inconsistent with public security and morality. Mr. Miall's second argument is, that while entering upon a formidable war, we should abstain from all that can occasion animosity between different classes of our countrymen. But surely our zeal for the overthrow of oppression abroad must be rather spurious if it supplies us with an argument for the toleration of oppression at home. If there be, as we have no doubt there are, a number of our countrywomen pining in an enforced conventual imprisonment, we fear that Mr. Miall's logic will appear to them about equally conclusive and consolatory. Should the faintest rumour of what is passing in the world reach them in their places of sepulture, we doubt if they will see any very close and satisfactory connexion between the perpetuation of their sufferings and the interference of the Czar with the sovereign rights of the Sultan.

The House of Commons appears to have felt the same difficulty, and

sympathizing more with the wrongs of young women than with the tactics of a ministry, left Lord John Russell in a minority of 67, and granted the committee of inquiry.

The motion of Mr. Whiteside should be here noticed. It was to the effect, that in the case of the disposal of property by persons under monastic vows, the burden of proof should lie upon the ecclesiastical superiors, to show that the disposition of the property was not made under any undue influence, whether spiritual, or otherwise; and that, in the absence of such proof, the disposition shall be null and void. It further proposes, that all persons regarded and treated as nuns should be so considered, and should thus come under the provisions of the bill, unless the contrary can be shown to the satisfaction of a competent tribunal.

Leave was given to bring in the bill, with the understanding that it should first be submitted to Mr. Chambers' committee.

THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER was brought before the House of Commons on the 6th. Under the imminence of the war the nation had been prepared for increased taxation, notwithstanding the commercial prosperity, which, through the sounder economy of recent years, had enriched the national treasury. The actual receipts of the exchequer, as compared with Mr. Gladstone's estimate last year, may be generally and briefly stated. Under the heads of excise, stamps, income-tax, post-office, crown lands, miscellaneous, and old stores, there is an increase; and that under some items, especially the stamps, the post-office, and the miscellaneous, to a considerable amount. Under the heads of customs and general taxes, we find a deficiency. The entire excess of the actual receipts over the estimates amounts to £1,035,000. On the other hand, the expenditure for which the house provided last session, was estimated at £52,183,000; but the actual expenditure, though swelled by charges for military operations, was but £51,171,000. So that while the income of the country was £1,035,000 more than the estimates, the expenditure was £1,012,000 less. After analyzing the details which constitute these results, the Chancellor of the Exchequer proceeded to lay before the House his estimates for the ensuing year. He reckoned the extra expense of our military expedition to the East at the rate of £50 per head for 25,000 men, or £1,250,000. After making other deductions, the result appeared an estimated deficiency of £2,840,000 per year. To meet this, Mr. Gladstone begged in the first place that no diminution should be conceded in the sources of revenue, and firmly laid down the principle that no new loan should be entered into, but that the entire expenses of the approaching war should be borne by the present generation. He proposed to increase the income-tax by one-half, levying the whole addition in respect of the first moiety of the year; in other words, to double the tax for the half year, raising its produce from £6,275,000 to £9,582,000. His next proposal was to abolish the distinction between the stamp charges on home and foreign drawn bills. He further expressed his intention to lay on the table a resolution for a vote of £1,750,000 for an issue of

exchequer bills. These proposals, after a very discursive debate, were ultimately agreed to. The press concurs with the legislature in approving this Budget. The Budget thus introduced, simply brings into question the important alternative of direct or indirect taxation. Equity appears to us obviously to sanction the decision of the legislature in favour of the former. Nothing, surely, can be more just than that every subject of this realm should pay for the protection of his property, as in ordinary cases of insurance, proportionally to the amount to be protected. The wisdom of an increased expenditure for a war with Russia, it is unnecessary here to discuss; but if increased national funds are to be raised for that or any other purpose, we deem it only fair that they should be contributed by each subject *pro ratâ*, rather than that a tax should be laid upon articles which some consume and some do not; thus merging all fiscal principles and practice in the vortex of a universal lottery.

WE ARE SORRY TO REPORT THAT MR. FAGAN'S MOTION for the abolition of the Irish tax called 'Ministers' Money' has been again defeated. It was submitted on the 9th, and Mr. Fagan proposed as a substitute that the protestant clergy should be paid out of the revenue of the commissioners appointed under the Church Temporalities Act. The history and nature of the rate are but little understood in this country. It was imposed by the 17th and 18th Charles II., c. 7, and consists of a rate of one shilling in the pound on the nominal rental of houses in Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Drogheda, Kilkenny, Clonmel, and Kinsale. No house can be assessed at a higher rental than £60, nor is any reduction allowed on account of the deterioration of property, which in many cases has been very great. The wealthy are thus favoured at the expense of the poor, the great majority of whom are Roman Catholics. Moreover, the tax is limited to those towns which are deemed Catholic. 'The protestant dissenters of the north of Ireland,' says the parliamentary committee of 1848, 'a powerful and influential body, are wholly exempt from an ecclesiastical charge, which the Roman Catholics of Ireland have always considered to be a grievance.' The protestant clergy are almost as unanimous as the catholic laity in reprobating the impost. Whatever difference may exist as to the substitute to be provided, all are agreed in condemning the tax as a fruitful source of irritation. Some would change its form, but the great majority of the people demand its entire extinction. Mr. Fagan's motion was seconded by Mr. Hume, and was met by an amendment, proposed avowedly as a *compromise* by Sir J. Young, Secretary for Ireland, and seconded by Lord Palmerston. We deeply regret the position which the government has thus taken. It is both unjust and impolitic, and affords no good augury of the course to be pursued respecting English Church rates. The vestry cess was abolished some years since, and all parties agree that its abolition was needful and wise. If so, the kindred charge termed 'Minister's Money' ought to share the same fate, and its maintenance betokens rather the strength of party than an enlightened estimate of what is just. In principle, the two imposts stand or fall together. A

condemnation of the one cannot be made to harmonize with a defence of the other. Both should be maintained or be relinquished, and the refusal of such a concession will only serve to accelerate the overthrow of the entire ecclesiastical system of Ireland. The Protestant Church of that country is a standing disgrace to our legislation. In proportion to its numbers it is the most richly-endowed church in Christendom, and the 'Minister's Money'—realizing only £15,000—is one of its most obvious iniquities. The plea of deficient funds raised on behalf of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners is utterly delusive, and goes far to show the reluctance with which the clergy will consent to part with the least of their immunities, however glaring the wrong to be corrected. On a division, Mr. Fagan's motion was negatived by 103 to 88.

Sir John Young's amendment that all houses rated at and under £10 should be exempted; that no houses built in future should be liable to the tax; and that means should be taken to ascertain what houses and tenements have hitherto been rateable, and the amounts they have respectively paid, 'with the view of providing that they should continue liable to the payment of that amount, and no more,' was affirmed on the 10th by 136 to 93. We are glad to observe that three English members, Messrs. Miall, Bright, and Hadfield, strongly protested against this amendment, which is clearly open to the same objection as had been urged against Mr. Fagan's motion on the ground of the inviolability of Church property. If there is no sacrilege in depriving the clergy of the contributions derived from houses of a £10 rental, there is clearly none in exempting those of a higher value. So far as *principle* is concerned, the amendment is open to the same objection as the original motion, while it utterly fails to meet the claims of justice or to satisfy the demands of the Irish people. 'He did not speak,' said Mr. Bright, 'as a dissenter personally opposed to the Established Church; but if he were anxious that the Established Church of Ireland, as a religious and protestant, and not as a political institution, should increase its influence in that country, he should be extremely desirous that it should be settled, not upon the basis of an unsatisfactory compromise, but in such a manner that no Roman Catholic hereafter could object to it, and say he had not had full justice done to him.' The minority on both these occasions consisted of the foremost section of the supporters of government; whilst the majority was composed of 120 tories, with nearly *thirty* holders of office, and *forty-four* 'liberals,' having, for the most part, personal connexion with members of the Cabinet.

According to notice, Mr. Miall divided the House on the second reading of the bill on the 20th; but his amendment, that it be read 'upon this day six months,' was lost by a majority of 106,—the numbers being 203 for Sir John Young's bill, and 97 against it. The constituencies of Southwark, Marylebone, Bristol, Coventry, and Northampton—to say nothing of other towns—should immediately communicate with their members, Messrs. Molesworth, Hall, Langton, Ellice, and Currie, on the votes they have given on this occasion. It is

of special importance that English liberals do full justice to the righteous claims of the people of Ireland.

ON THE 14TH MR. PELLATT MOVED FOR LEAVE TO INTRODUCE A BILL to enable persons who had conscientious objections to oaths to substitute a solemn declaration in their stead. Mr. Hadfield seconded the motion, and Lord Palmerston acquiesced in the introduction of the measure, 'reserving to the Government full discretion as to the course they might take with regard to its second reading.' He admitted that a great number of oaths might advantageously be dispensed with, but maintained 'that the more enlightened a man was, the more sensible he must be of the obligation imposed upon him, by a solemn invocation of the Deity, to tell the truth; and with regard to ignorant men, it was perfectly notorious that a man who wished to give false testimony, for the purpose of screening a culprit or enforcing a claim which he knew to be wrongful, would have the greatest possible inducement and facility for giving false evidence if he was allowed to exempt himself from the solemn obligation of an oath by a mere declaration that he entertained a conscientious scruple to an oath.' The Attorney-General explained the intentions of Government in the Bill introduced into the Upper House, founded on the report of the common-law commissioners, and contended that that Bill would afford to the really conscientious all the relief proposed by the honorable member for Southwark. 'The object to be accomplished,' he remarked, 'was to give relief to those persons who really entertained religious scruples against oaths, while they took care to prevent persons who did not entertain such scruples—but who did entertain apprehensions of the results hereafter if they called upon the name of God with falsehood upon their lips—from pretending that they did feel conscientious scruples on the subject of oaths.' On the whole, we think it would have been wise in Mr. Pellatt to defer his motion until the fate of the Government Bill was known. He, however, persisted, and his motion was carried by a majority of one, the numbers being 109 for, and 108 against it. We hope the measure will now be engrafted on that of the government. The feeling of the House in favor of alteration is gratifying, and we are satisfied that the interests of public morals will be advantaged by the change. Our present system is offensively impious, and justly obnoxious to conscientious scruples.

THE LAWS OF MORTMAIN, AND THE LAWS REGULATING THE GIFTS TO CHARITABLE AND RELIGIOUS PURPOSES, were brought by Mr. Headlam under the consideration of the House of Commons on the 16th of March. His purpose was to repeal the existing law, and to enact provisions more suitable to the circumstances of the times, and more effectual for the prevention of the particular abuses against which the law was directed, while they would be less obstructive and inconvenient, being enabling as well as restraining. Mr. Headlam showed that laws as early as the reign of Edward the First had been enacted to prevent the evasion of the statute, and that the arbitrary power of Henry the Eighth had quashed them by a decisive act. He proposed to remedy the hardship

of the present state of the law, that whenever a charitable bequest was given, there must be a suit in Chancery to administer the estate, and that the expences of that suit were paid out of the residue of the testator's estate, whose family, therefore, had not only to pay the charitable legacy, but also the expences of the suit. The great purpose is to secure that the devise of property, whether personal or real, should not be made in a state of comparative mental incapacity, and under spiritual *duress*, on the death-bed. Mr. Headlam proposes that personal estate, of whatever nature, should be subjected to one law with respect to bequests, namely, that the will giving such estate must be executed three months before the death of the testator. With respect to real estate, he urged that the provisions of the existing law should be maintained intact. He proposes, however, that specific objects, books, pictures, statues, and objects of that kind, might be given without restriction to public institutions, such as the National Gallery, British Museum, and establishments of that description. His avowed object was not so much to alter the law of mortmain radically as to modify it with regard to personalty, and to supersede the oppressive litigation to which it now gives rise. Leave was given to bring in the bill, and the Attorney-General, on the part of government, declared that the time was come for a general reconsideration of the laws of mortmain. There is no danger of any relaxation of those provisions by which greedy ecclesiastics are prevented from alienating property from its natural heirs. But, if consistently with this restriction, facilities can be offered for the performance on the part of the rich of what may be called their posthumous duties, an end of no small importance will have been gained.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE LIBERATION OF RELIGION FROM STATE PATRONAGE AND CONTROL is prosecuting its work in real earnest. At the *Triennial Conference* of November last, it was resolved to appoint a parliamentary committee to watch the course of ecclesiastical legislation, and the Society has been fortunate enough to obtain the services of C. J. Foster, Esq., LL.D., as chairman of such committee. A more eligible appointment could not have been made. Dr. Foster is pre-eminently qualified for the post, and will do all which intelligence, earnestness, legal skill, and untiring activity, can effect. In order that the labors of this committee should be productive of their anticipated fruits, it is needful that the funds of the Society be greatly recruited. For this purpose a private meeting of its friends was held at Radley's Hotel, in the beginning of February, and a more numerous and public *soirée* took place on the 8th, at the Whittington Club, Strand, when several members of parliament, and other gentlemen interested in the subject, were present. A petition to the House of Commons, praying for the admission of all classes to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge was unanimously adopted, together with the following two resolutions:—

‘That this meeting, believing it to be the duty of the friends of Voluntaryism to avail themselves of multiplied facilities for commending their principles to the attention of the public and of parliament, regards with great satisfaction the arrangements made by the Executive

Committee for increasing the practical efficiency of the 'Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage and Control.'

'That as the extent and the success of the Society's operations must be greatly dependent on the degree of pecuniary support which it receives, this meeting is prepared to unite in carrying out the proposals of the late Conference, to raise an annual income of £5000 for the next three years.'

A considerable amount of *subscriptions* for three years was immediately pledged, which we are happy to report has since been greatly increased. One of the most pleasing features of the movement is the appearance of several large subscriptions, ranging from £50 downwards. It is also gratifying to find that the Society is securing the co-operation of numerous parties who stood aloof from its earlier movements, and we trust that the number of such adhesions will go on and increase, until all sections of British Nonconformity are united in the zealous support of an association to whose principles they are universally pledged. Attention is now to be directed to the provinces, where we trust there will be displayed the same generous spirit as London has shown. We have known too much of the difficulties with which the earlier friends of the Society had to struggle from straitened resources, not to rejoice very heartily at the more prosperous financial career which is now opening upon it.

THE MINISTERIAL MEASURE ON THE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES OF OXFORD was introduced by Lord John Russell on the 17th. It comprises, as was to be expected, a vast number of provisions which cannot be clearly understood without an attentive perusal of his lordship's speech. To this we counsel our readers. The plan has many good features. It will undoubtedly correct manifold evils, and will open up to this ancient school the prospect of enlarged and progressive improvement. The governing body of the university is to be entirely remodelled; the encroachments of colleges are to be restrained; greater freedom of action is to be insured; progressive improvement to be provided for; and the general course of study to be adapted to the requirements of the age. Amongst other regulations pertaining to the colleges, it is provided that, 'All oaths directed against the disclosure of college matters, or the acceptance of college changes, are to be abolished. All preferential claims to college preferment arising from other circumstances than those of personal qualifications are, with certain exceptions, to be extinguished. Subject to these exceptions, all fellowships and scholarships are to be open to the whole university, and filled up by public examination. Fellowships are not to be made necessarily terminable, but they are to be held as vacated within one year from the time of election unless the holder shall be resident for not less than twenty-four weeks in each year, and shall be occupied during such period either in tuition, or in the discharge of university or parochial duties, or in private study.' In extension of the university system, it is proposed that members of convocation of a certain standing may be licensed to open their own houses, if within a mile and a half of the university, as private halls for the reception of students; and commissioners are to be appointed, who will be empowered, on the

colleges failing to do so, prior to the first day of Michaelmas term, 1855, to make ordinances for the foundation of professorships, the opening of fellowships, and other desirable objects. So far all is well. Without entering into a minute examination of the details of the measure, we cannot hesitate to express a warm approval of its general character. The bill, if carried through parliament, will effect a vast improvement. Some of its provisions may be open to exception, but, as a whole, the friends of university reform must regard it with favor.

On one point the measure entirely fails to meet the reasonable expectations of the country. 'There remains,' said Lord John, and his words will best explain our meaning, 'one question upon which there is no provision in the bill; but upon which I shall be ready at any time to give my opinion, and my vote in conformity with the opinion which I have always given. I cannot think that the purposes of the university are advanced while there is a test at the commencement of entrance into it. I never would consent to any measure by which the discipline of the colleges, or the conduct of the religious instruction in the colleges, or the attendance upon divine worship was in any way interfered with; but I do expect, certainly, that by the addition of these new halls facilities will be afforded which may induce parliament not to interpose the obstacles which have hitherto been interposed to the enjoyment of the benefits of those great schools of learning by a far greater portion of her Majesty's subjects than now enjoy them. I do not think that it would be wise, and her Majesty's government have decided accordingly, to insert any provision upon this subject in the present bill. It is a subject which divides both this and the other House of Parliament, and it should be, I think, a subject reserved for a separate measure, and for separate consideration. I certainly shall be always prepared at any time to give my vote in the same manner that I gave it twenty years ago. That vote I gave in company with the present Chancellor of the University of Oxford. I am afraid that I shall no longer give it with the sanction and countenance of such authority; but I shall be quite ready, nevertheless, to give my vote in favour of the admission of dissenters. As I have already said, however, that forms no part of the present bill.' The feelings of his lordship in making this acknowledgment must surely have been anything but pleasing. His own views are sufficiently evident. They have been recorded in the votes he has given; but as the organ of the ministry he is compelled to forego the most favorable opportunity his political life has ever known of carrying those views into effect. At the very time that Oxford is to be reformed, with a view of bringing it into closer harmony with the wants and sympathies of the nation, the one alteration which of all others is most suited to this end is thrown aside, and vague hopes are expressed of a silent revolution to be effected by private halls not yet existing, and which, for aught we know, may never be called into being. Such language proceeding from such a man is both painful and mortifying. What makes the case more glaring is, that a memorial was presented to his lordship on the 3rd, signed by one

hundred and two members of the Commons House, respectfully yet earnestly entreating that in any bill respecting the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge which the government might bring forward, provision should be made 'for the free admission of any of her Majesty's subjects, duly qualified by intellectual attainments, to matriculation and graduation at both these ancient universities without the imposition of any religious test.' Lord John and his colleagues were therefore fully apprised of the views of a large section of their supporters; and yet those views are coolly set aside under the flimsy pretext, and with the delusive intimation, mentioned by his lordship. It remains to be seen what course the memorialists will take. Opportunities will occur of testing the feeling of the House, and we hope they will be vigorously improved. Mr. Heywood has given notice of his intention to move the insertion of a clause for the admission of dissenters. Report says that the Cabinet will oppose him. Should they do so, we would have our friends propose a reference of the bill to a select committee. In its present form it will substitute King Stork for King Log. We do not want this, and if faithful to ourselves we need not have it. If nothing else will suffice, the ministry must feel the power of the men whose views they so disregard. Fear of the Upper House must be counterbalanced by fear of the Commons. Their desire to conciliate the bishops must be neutralized by their aim to retain the support of those who are amongst their staunchest and most intelligent supporters. Let no dissenting member be deluded by the expectation of a separate measure for our special benefit. Nothing of the sort will be attempted. Now is the time for action, and the measure before the House is precisely the one by which the admission asked ought to be effected. What cannot be obtained from the justice of ministers must be extorted from their fears. The second reading of the bill is fixed for Monday, the 3rd of April, when we hope that an instructive lesson will be read to Lord John and his associates.

THE REV. THOMAS STRATTEN, the honoured minister of Fish Street Chapel, Hull, departed this life just before the publication of our last number, and we desire to place on record a brief expression of our regard for his memory. Mr. Stratten was, in his youth, a member of Mr. Jay's Church in Bath, and retained through life a strong tincture of resemblance to his early pastor, in the tone and manner of his preaching. After studying at Hoxton College, he began his ministry at Chertsey, whence he soon removed to a large and handsome new chapel at Bishopwearmouth, Sunderland. There he laboured with much success and solidly advancing influence for twelve years; and, in fellowship with the late Dr. Matheson, and one or two other ministers who still survive, established the Durham and Northumberland Association of Congregational Churches, in connexion with which he actively devoted himself to the spread of the Gospel, and of non-conformist principles and usages in those northern counties. In the earlier part of his ministry, Mr. Stratten was but slightly disposed to dwell much on the peculiarities of dissenting churches; yet, having once entered a personal protest against church rates in his own parish,

he exhibited a stronger grasp of the fundamental truths of evangelical dissent, and laid himself out for their exposition and defence. In connexion with the formation of a congregational church at Morpeth, in Northumberland, he delivered to a crowded audience in the Town Hall of the borough a very extraordinary discourse, which he afterwards expanded in an able and interesting volume—'The Book of the Priesthood.' This was followed up by a smaller work, displaying much scriptural investigation, on 'English and Jewish Tithes Compared.'

In 1832 or 1833, Mr. Stratten—who had previously declined a proposal to become the minister of the Tabernacle in Moorfields—removed from Sunderland to Hull, where he ministered to a large and influential congregation, notwithstanding the secession of some prominent members of the church to form the new congregation at Albion Chapel. The only publication of any magnitude he sent forth after his removal to Hull, is an ingenious, judicious, and attractive volume on the 'Apostolic Succession,' and some kindred topics, bearing on the controversies with the Roman Catholics and the Tractarians. With much firmness of principle, decision of character, and independence of judgment, Mr. Stratten united a kind spirit, a tender piety, a deep concern for the spirituality of the churches, and the earnestness of the ministry, while he entered heartily into the genius and operations of the Evangelical Alliance. His cheerful companionship, his pastoral fidelity and diligence, and the general dignity and suavity of his demeanor, endeared him to a large circle of strictly attached friends, of whom it was the happiness of one of the editors of the 'Eclectic' to be among the oldest. The tidings of his death came upon us most unexpectedly: for he was a strong man, with all the elements of a probably long life. He was sixty years of age, and had but a brief passage through the final scene. Calm, and even joyful, he 'crossed the flood,' and has left a name of gentle and holy power in many hearts.

THE COURSE OF EVENTS, IN RELATION TO TURKEY, HAS BEEN MUCH WHAT WE EXPECTED. Russia declines to withdraw from the Principalities, and the preparations for war in France and our own country have proceeded with unexampled rapidity. Whatever opinions may be held respecting the indecision and dilatoriness of our ministry in the course of last year, all must admit the activity, determination, and promptitude of their recent proceedings. Large forces have been despatched to the east, and Sir Charles Napier has proceeded towards the Baltic, with the first portion of a squadron which, for magnitude and effective force, has never been equalled. The *Moniteur*, the *Hercule*, the *Duguesclin*, and the *Trident*, have also been despatched by the French Government, and several other ships are speedily to follow. This is as it should be. We deeply deplore the occurrence of war, but if it must be—and the necessity is all but universally admitted—then the more decisive its operations the better. The great disturber of Europe must be taught a salutary lesson, and we trust that the force employed will be sufficient for this purpose. His intense ambition must be checked in the only way of which it admits, and an effectual barrier be raised against the recurrence of evils such as are now threatened. The passion for territorial aggrandizement evinced

by the Czar is in itself sufficient to awaken the indignant protest of all free nations, but his offence is aggravated by the impious attempt to cover his ambition by the cloak of religious zeal. In his *manifesto* of the 9th of February, England and France are said to 'have sided with the enemies of Christianity against Russia fighting for the orthodox faith;' and, as if this were not enough, the language of religious zeal is prostituted to veil his perfidy and ambition. 'May the Almighty,' says the Czar, 'assist us to prove this by deeds. With this hope, combatting for our persecuted brethren, followers of the faith of Christ, with one accord let all Russia exclaim "O Lord, our Redeemer! whom shall we fear? May God be glorified, and His enemies be scattered."'

A more mendacious *manifesto* was never issued. It was known to be so at the time, but crushing evidence has since been produced in the *Correspondence* between the courts of St. Petersburg and London recently given to parliament. A formal requisition has been addressed to the Czar by the western powers, requiring his immediate evacuation of the Principalities. To this requisition of the western powers, the autocrat refuses to render a reply. A royal message, announcing the termination of negotiations, has consequently been addressed to both Houses, which is to be taken into consideration on Friday the 31st. A declaration of war will follow as matter of course.

In the meantime, intelligent men are asking what can induce the Czar to persist in a course so manifestly ruinous to himself? A few days probably will enable us to answer this inquiry. We have not so mean an opinion of his political sagacity as to believe that he is influenced only by passion. We cannot but suspect a secret understanding with Austria and Prussia. For the honor and the safety of these states we hope it may turn out otherwise; but as at present advised, we mistrust their intentions, and are prepared for their ultimate adhesion to Russia. As intimated last month, we are no believers in the reported failure of Count Orloff's mission, and what has since occurred only serves to strengthen our doubts. To the position of Austria we have referred in another place, and shall not therefore say more at present. The German powers may not take an active part in the war—they are too selfish and too much crippled, it may be, to allow of this; but we suspect their neutrality, and have no faith in the honesty of their professions.

It becomes all devout men, in prospect of the fearful crisis which has arisen, to invoke the interposing providence of God, that permanent good may be deduced from temporary evil. The nations of Europe are groaning beneath a despotism which knows no mercy and observes no faith.. May the time of their redemption be drawing nigh. May the cry of the oppressed enter into the ear of the God of heaven, that the tenants of dungeons, the exiles now wandering from their father-lands, may return to their homes, ennobled by sufferings, and better prepared than ever for the reception and maintenance of constitutional freedom.

Literary Intelligence.

Just Published.

The Study of German Simplified, in a New Systematic and Practical Grammar, according to the Systems of Allendorf and Dr. Ahn. By H. Mannheimer. Author of the 'Perfect Speaker.'

Conversations on Geography; or, the Child's first Introduction to Where he is, What he is, and what else there is besides. By Viscountess Falmouth, Baroness le Despencer.

Mechanical Inventions and Suggestions on Land and Water Locomotion, Tooth Machinery, and various other branches of Theoretical and Practical Mechanics. By Lewis Gompertz, Esq.

Appendix to the Author's late Works—Mechanical Inventions, &c. By Lewis Gompertz, Esq.

Popery as it exists in Great Britain and Ireland, its Doctrines, Practices, and Arguments. Exhibited from the Writings of its Advocates, and from its most Popular Books of Instruction and Devotion. By Rev. John Montgomery, A.M.

A Dozen Ballads for the Times about White Slavery. By the Author of 'Proverbial Philosophy.'

The Chronicles of Merry England Rehearsed unto her People, Books I.—VI. By the Author of 'Mary Powell.'

Future Punishments. Must they Necessarily be Endless? The Question examined by the Light of the New Testament. By Quærens.

The Elements of Political Science. In Two Books. Book I. On Method. Book II. On Doctrine. With an Account of Andrew Yarranton, the Founder of English Political Economy. By Patrick Edward Dove.

The Bible; its Oneness of Mind, and Oneness of Design. By Rev. David Laing, M.A., F.R.S.

The Sensibility of Separate Souls Considered. By Caleb Webb. With Second Appendix.

Truths Maintained. By James Biden, Author of the 'True Church.'

Poems. By David Bates.

Dress as a Fine Art. By Mrs. Merrifield.

Evenings in my Tent; or, Wanderings in Balad Ejjareed; Illustrating the Moral, Religious, Social, and Political Conditions of Various Arab Tribes of the African Sahara. By Rev. N. Davis, F.R.S.S.A. Two Vols.

Turkey; or, a History of the Ottoman Empire. By George Fowler.

History of the French Protestant Refugees from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the Present Time. By Charles Weiss. Translated, with the Assistance of the Author, by Frederick Hardman.

Lessons Suggested by the Death of Venerable Pastors; a Sermon Preached at Hanover Chapel, Peckham, on the Evening of the Funeral of the Rev. William Bengo Collyer, D.D., LL.D. By the Rev John Morrison, D.D., LL.D.

Lectures to Young Men: The Age; Its Advantages and Temptations—The Bible; Its Conflicts and Triumphs—The Sabbath; Its Claims and Benefits—The Sunday School; Its Position and Prospects. By J. Morrison, D.D., LL.D.

The Question Considered: Is it Justifiable to administer Chloroform in Surgical Operations, &c. By James Arnott, M.D.

An Account of the Life and Letters of Cicero. Translated from the German of Bernard Rudolf Abeken. Edited by Charles Merivale, B.D., Author of 'The History of the Romans.'

Decimal Money Tables, to enable any one to convert at sight English money into decimal money.

The Roman Empire the Empire of the Edomite. By William Burton.